

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

14 April 2015

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Stevens, Kathryn (2013) 'Secrets in the library : protected scholarship and professional identity in Late Babylonian Uruk.', Iraq., 75 . pp. 211-253.

Further information on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0021088900000474>

Publisher's copyright statement:

Copyright © The British Institute for the Study of Iraq 2013

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Iraq

<http://journals.cambridge.org/IRQ>

Additional services for *Iraq*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Secrets in the Library: Protected Knowledge and Professional Identity in Late Babylonian Uruk

Kathryn Stevens

Iraq / Volume 75 / January 2013, pp 211 - 253

DOI: 10.1017/S0021088900000474, Published online: 22 April 2014

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0021088900000474

How to cite this article:

Kathryn Stevens (2013). Secrets in the Library: Protected Knowledge and Professional Identity in Late Babylonian Uruk. *Iraq*, 75, pp 211-253 doi:10.1017/S0021088900000474

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SECRETS IN THE LIBRARY: PROTECTED KNOWLEDGE AND PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY IN LATE BABYLONIAN URUK¹

By KATHRYN STEVENS

Injunctions to secrecy in the colophons of scholarly cuneiform tablets offer potential insights into the classification and protection of knowledge in Mesopotamia. However, most models of a body of “secret knowledge” defined by the so-called “*Geheimwissen* colophons” have found it difficult to account for a seemingly disparate corpus of protected texts. This study argues first for an expanded definition of intellectual protection, which leads to a larger corpus of protected texts. Through a case study of Late Babylonian colophons from Uruk, it is suggested that there is a strong correlation between texts related to the professional specialism of the tablet owner, and the occurrence of protective formulae in the colophon. This implies that it is fruitful to consider “secret knowledge” less as an abstracted corpus of esoteric texts and more as a mutable categorisation strongly linked to professional and individual intellectual identity.

Tablet of Anu-bēlšunu, lamentation priest of Anu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Sîn-lēqi-unninni, Urukean . . . Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea [shall not take] it [away] by ‘theft’. Ephemeris, wisdom of *Anūtu*, secret of the [great] god[s], wisdom of the scholars. One who knows may show [one who knows]; one who does not know may not [see. Restriction] of Anu, Ellil and [Ea, the great gods].²

Colophon to TCL 6, 24+ (lunar ephemeris).

Tablet of Anu-bēlšunu, lamentation priest of Anu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Sîn-lēqi-unninni, Tiranaean . . . Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea shall not take it away by theft.

Colophon to TCL 6, 12+ (microzodiac).

The use of writing as a protective mechanism to safeguard written artefacts has a long history in Mesopotamia. From the third millennium onwards, written sanctions appear on objects bearing texts of various kinds, including treaties, royal inscriptions and, in the late second and first millennia, scholarly compositions. The two colophons excerpted above, both from Hellenistic Uruk, exemplify a concern with the protection of intellectual material which is evident in many first-millennium scholarly tablets. Given the rarity of explicit reflections by Mesopotamian scholars upon their intellectual activity, these protective measures in colophons have generated interest as a potential source of insights into issues such as the classification and status of different types of knowledge, the ways in which access to scholarly material was organised and controlled, and the intellectual self-positioning of Assyrian and Babylonian scribes.³

¹ This article was originally written with the support of an AHRC doctoral studentship, and revised during a postdoctoral fellowship at the Centre for Canon and Identity Formation at the University of Copenhagen in 2012–13; it also benefited from insightful comments and questions from the members of the Centre for Canon and Identity Formation on a seminar paper presented in November 2011. I am grateful to Eleanor Robson, Dorothy Thompson, Nicole Brisch, and Matthias Egeler for many helpful suggestions, and to Jonathan Taylor and the anonymous reviewer at *Iraq* for their comments which led to considerable improvements in the argument. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own.

² Transliterations and translations are the author’s unless otherwise stated.

³ For a full critical review of previous scholarship on the *Geheimwissen* colophons see Lenzi 2008: 2–15, with the addition of Scheil 1918 and Offner 1950 on other protective

formulae. The main milestones are Borger 1964, Beaulieu 1992, and now Lenzi himself. Although I disagree with Lenzi’s views on protective mechanisms and the *Geheimwissen* colophons, my interpretation of the distribution of protective formulae supports his broader claims about a connection between protected knowledge and the specialised corpora of the different scholarly professions, and fits well with the scholarly rhetoric of exclusivity he discusses in Ch. 2. Since secrecy, esotericism, and protected knowledge are of interest within a variety of Assyriological fields, passing remarks on these colophons also appear in many other works. Three in particular foreshadow the arguments presented here in their discussion of the *Geheimwissen* colophons in terms of exclusive rather than “esoteric” knowledge, and in relation to the professional activity of scribes. These are Neugebauer 1955 Vol I: 12, Beaulieu 2000: 14–15, and Rochberg 2004: 210–19.

However, such insights have proved difficult to pin down. From Offner's first survey of protective formulae in 1950, through Borger's *Geheimwissen* article which set the tone for future scholarship by focusing on colophons with explicit reference to secrecy and concealment, to Lenzi's book-length treatment of secrecy in Mesopotamia and Israel, the apparently "inconsistent" distribution of the so-called *Geheimwissen* colophons is a recurring and intractable problem.⁴ No model has so far been proposed which can satisfactorily account for the size or nature of the *Geheimwissen* corpus.⁵ With only fifty-five "secret" tablets, this constitutes a remarkably small fraction of the surviving scholarly material from Mesopotamia, even taking into account the fact that many tablets are broken and missing colophons altogether.

More problematic still is the composition of the corpus; it has not been possible to find a common denominator which links together these tablets but also separates them from the mass of unprotected material. The texts to which *Geheimwissen* colophons are attached come from most areas of cuneiform scholarship, apparently without any clear patterns; the same composition may be labelled as "secret" in one manuscript and not another, or, in the case of series, one tablet may be protected but not the next. The resulting image of random or at best inconsistent distribution is at odds with the level of conscious composition we might expect in colophons, which were the *only* part of a copied tablet where scholars could exercise free choice over form and content and could stamp their own identity onto their work.⁶ This problem has still not been satisfactorily resolved; indeed, Lenzi's "solution" works not by finding coherence but by categorically stating that there is none to be found:

The texts marked with this special colophon are in no way to be distinguished from other scholarly texts. In fact, the question plaguing their study, Why are these particular texts marked?, is a dead end.⁷

I hope to demonstrate that this is in fact far from the case, and that the incoherence of the secret corpus owes more to the scholarly practices of the twentieth century A.D. than those of the first millennium B.C. First, a re-examination and modification of the *Geheimwissen* typology in the light of methodological considerations and the evidence of a range of surviving colophons will yield a broader definition of intellectual protection, and hence an expanded range of tablets containing protected knowledge. The coherent patterns which can be traced among protected tablets will then be illustrated by a case study of colophons from Late Achaemenid and Seleucid Uruk. Here, instead of a top-down perspective which seeks to identify and explain a single, abstract body of "secret knowledge", I will adopt a bottom-up, contextualised approach which highlights the agency of intellectual practitioners, both groups and individuals. When the material is analysed from this angle, close and specific correlations can be detected between the professional specialism of a scholar and the distribution of protective colophons among the tablets he owned and/or wrote. It will also be suggested that in certain groups' shifting usage of protective formulae over time we may see a reflection of intellectual change, as scholars redefined the knowledge at the core of their professional activity. Tracing the patterns of the protective formulae will prove to be not a dead end but rather a step towards a greater understanding of scholarly praxis and identity.

I. *Secrecy, security and the protection of knowledge*

According to the typology developed by Borger, a *Geheimwissen* colophon maximally contains the following three elements:⁸

⁴ Offner 1950: 143; Borger 1964: 190; Lenzi 2008: 2–3.

⁵ Beaulieu's general link with "expository texts" and "speculative thinking" (1992: 107–08) is invalidated by the number of counter-examples. Limet's "special categories" (1986: 248–49) and Lenzi's idea that *all* scholarly texts were secret but only exceptionally labeled as such (2008: 204–15) do not explain the actual distribution of protective measures; see further Section I below.

⁶ Rochberg 2004: 211. I disagree with Lenzi's view that colophons in general are inconsistent and that this in fact

helps to explain the inconsistency of the *Geheimwissen* subset (2008: 206). Close examination of the Late Babylonian Uruk colophons shows ordered variation in their elements, down to the level of wording and sign choices. Lenzi's example of the "caprice" of colophon elements, the copying statement *šajirma bari*, "written and checked", in fact shows meaningful patterns in its distribution—see Robson 2011: 566–69.

⁷ Lenzi 2008: 214.

⁸ Borger 1964: 189.

- A) *mūdū mūdā likallim* “One who knows may show one who knows.”
 B) *lā mūdū lā immar/ ayy-īmur* “One who does not know may not see.”
 C) *ikkib ilī rabūti* “Restriction of the great gods.”⁹

The occurrence in a colophon of A) or B), or the simpler *pirišti* ^(d)X, “secret of X”, which Lenzi calls a “secrecy label”, was deemed necessary and sufficient by Borger and others to classify the relevant text as “secret knowledge.”¹⁰ The choice of these particular phrases is easily comprehensible, as they make explicit reference to possessing, showing and withholding knowledge. However, there are difficulties here.

The first is the lack of contextual differentiation. The “secret” tablets as defined by Borger and Lenzi derive from contexts which are temporally, spatially and intellectually disparate, ranging from the vast Neo-Assyrian royal libraries to private houses and temples in Achaemenid and Hellenistic Uruk and Babylon. Since Borger’s article we have gained a much greater understanding of the variability of textual traditions over time and space. Despite the conservatism of cuneiform scholarship, it is increasingly clear that even the so-called “canonical” series exhibit local and chronological variations in content and structure. It is then hardly surprising that no consistent patterns can be found within the diverse material of the *Geheimwissen* “corpus”.

Indeed, without any contextual link, the only connection between these tablets is the shared attestation of the phrases selected as significant by Borger and others, and here a second issue arises. There is no difficulty with classing as protected knowledge the contents of tablets marked with formulae which explicitly mention restricted access to intellectual material. What is problematic is the assumption that *only* these formulae reflect a concern with protecting the knowledge contained in the text. This narrowly philological approach rests on a subjective conception of the kind of language required to imply a concern with the control of knowledge, in this case terms relating to knowing, seeing, revealing and concealing. A focus on these semantic ranges is justified in a philological study of concepts of secrecy or concealment in Mesopotamian scholarship, which is one of the aims of both Borger and Lenzi. However, there is an elision in their work and that of others between this and the broader historiographical project of delineating and explaining protected knowledge and protective mechanisms in the Mesopotamian intellectual domain. The result is that the *Geheimwissen* formulae, and no others, have come to be seen as necessary to indicate any concern with the protection of knowledge. In this way, Assyriologists have created a decontextualised corpus of secret or exclusive knowledge, according to a restrictive concept of intellectual protection which proceeds from largely intuitive categories rather than from a full examination of the range and usage of Akkadian terms in protective formulae. In fact, this narrow understanding of intellectual protection is undermined once such an examination is undertaken.¹¹

To illustrate the problem, let us return for a moment to the two colophons with which we began, quoted this time in full:

šá an-gi, 30 | ʾim m^d60-en-šū-nu lū gala d60 ma-rū šá mⁿig-sum-mu-d60 a m^d30-ti-ér unug^{ki}-ú qāt m^d60-[aba-utēr mārīšu] | [tupšar Enūma] d60 d^en-lil-lā tir-an-na^{ki}-ú unug^{ki} itū [bā]r mu-1-ME-2 1 kām m^an-ti-ʾi-i-ku-su [šār] | pa-liḫ 21 50 u 40 ina šur²-qa² [lā itabbal]-šū | a-ru-ú né-me-qí d60-ú-tú ad-ḫal dingir^{mes} gal^{mes} | mī-ūru lūm-man-nu lūzu^a ana lūmūdī | li-kal-lim la lūzu^a nu [immar ikkib] | a-[n]im d^en-lil-lā ū [Ea ilāni rabūti].

Eclipses of Šin. Tablet of Anu-bēlšunu, lamentation priest of Anu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Sin-lēqi-unninni, Urukian. Hand of Anu-[aba-utēr, his son, scribe of (the series) *Enūma*] *Anu Ellil*, Tiranaean. Uruk, [Nisan]nu, year 121, Antiochus [king]. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea [shall not take] it [away] by ‘theft’¹². Ephemeris, wisdom of *Anūtu*, secret of the [great] god[s], wisdom of the scholars. One who knows may show [one who knows]; one who does not know may not [see. Restriction] of Anu, Ellil and [Ea, the great gods].

⁹ See Lenzi 2008: 168–69, n. 157 on the translation and mistranslation of *mūdū* and *ikkibu* in these colophons.

¹⁰ Lenzi 2008: 170–85. X is usually a specific god or the divine collective, but variants include “secret of heaven and earth” and “secret of kingship.”

¹¹ Lenzi rightly criticises the unhelpful use of intuitive categories of “secret” or “esoteric” (2008: 3). He himself gives

explicit reasons for excluding protective formulae other than *Geheimwissen* clauses and secrecy labels; however, his understanding of intellectual protection also seems somewhat intuitive.

¹² See Appendix, Table H, Colophon 45 for the restoration of the formula.

ta ugu ^{gis}da sumun^{bar} gaba-ri unug^{ki} sar-ma igi-tab | ^rup⁷-pi ^{md}60-en-šú-nu ^{lu}gala ^d60 ma-rù šá ^{mnig}sum-mu-^d60 ma-rù ^{md}30-ti-ér tir-an-na^{ki}-ú qāt ^{md}60-ad-gur a-šú ^{lu}umbisag ^u4 ^d60 ^den⁷-[lil]][[^m]an⁷-ti-i-ku-su ^{lugal} mud ^d60 en-lil u ^didim ina šur-qa là tùm-šú.

From an old writing board, a copy from Uruk, written and checked. Tablet of Anu-bēšunu, lamentation priest of Anu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Šin-lēqi-unninni, Tiranaean. Hand of Anu-aba-utēr, his son, scribe of (the series) *Enūma Anu El*[lil. . . .] Antiochus king. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea shall not take it away by theft.

These colophons, and the tablets on which they are inscribed, have much in common. Both were owned and written by the same two individuals—Anu-bēšunu and his son Anu-aba-utēr, who were both *kalūs*, or lamentation priests, of the Rēš temple in Uruk.¹³ Although their exact provenance is unknown, it is likely that both tablets came from the Rēš, where others belonging to Anu-bēšunu and his family have been excavated. Both colophons also contain protective formulae which invoke the same divine agents, but only the first fits the *Geheimwissen* typology. The second includes a prohibitive formula which is extremely common in colophons from Uruk and elsewhere: *pāliḥ DN lā itabbalšu*, “whoever reveres god X shall not take it (i.e. the tablet) away.” The gods invoked vary, often with a bias towards the dominant local deities; in Seleucid Uruk we usually find Anu and Antu, while colophons from contemporary Babylon call upon Marduk and Šarpānītu. The prohibition is sometimes coupled with a symmetrical curse, *ša itabbalu DN (u DN) litbalšu*, “whoever takes (the tablet) away, may the god(s) X (and Y) take him away”, as in the following colophon of an early Hellenistic tablet owned by the Uruk *āšipu* Iqīšāya:

pa-liḥ ^da-nu-um ^d50⁷ u ^didim nu tùm-šú ina me-reš-ti-šú la ú-šam-kiš-šú ina u⁴-šú ana é umun-šú ḥe-gur-šú šá tùm-šú ^dim u ^dša⁷-la lit-bal-šú

Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil⁷ and Ea shall not take it away, shall not deliberately let it be lost. On the same day he shall return it to the house of its owner. Whoever takes it away, may Adad and Šala take him away.¹⁴

The *tabālu* formulae were not included by Borger and are explicitly disqualified by Lenzi, who argues that “the *pāliḥ* formula seems more concerned with the material safety and well-being of the tablet than with the unauthorized use of it, which is the primary concern of the *Geheimwissen* colophon.”¹⁵ However, a distinction between material and intellectual protection makes little sense in this context, since tablets were valuable not for their medium but for their contents. Relatively fragile and ephemeral to their writers, clay tablets were merely the temporary bearers of texts which were rendered precious by their antique, even divine, origins, and their transmission through many centuries of careful and faithful copying.¹⁶ The physical conditions of Mesopotamian scholarship meant that there was no valorisation of the “original” manuscript, but rather a great concern with the fidelity of the current copy in relation to its predecessors, for it was this that determined the continued authenticity of the text.¹⁷ Given the physical fragility of clay tablets and the ease with which at least some inscribed objects could be transported, it is unsurprising that the wording of some protective formulae emphasises “material” considerations such as damage or theft. It seems likely, however, that even when the “material” protection of the tablet is explicitly at issue in the colophon, what is at stake is still the *intellectual* loss—either of the textual content itself or of a monopoly on that content—which is entailed by this “material” loss.

¹³ Based on her study of first millennium Ezida, Caroline Waerzeggers only defines an individual as a “priest” if they held a prebend as well as the relevant ritual qualifications; without the prebend they were denied access to temple worship (2010: 34). Current evidence for the prebendary status of the Uruk *āšipus* and *kalūs* in the Late Babylonian period is slim. The *āšipūtu* prebend is attested in two documents (McEwan 1981: 71–73); only one tablet explicitly refers to the *kalūtu* prebend (*BiMes* 24, 47) but there are several relating to the neck-cut which was usually assigned to this prebend (Beaulieu 2000: 10–11). Whatever the precise socio-economic relationship of these individuals to the temple, they were clearly involved in cultic performance. Despite the risk of anachronism, I have found it useful here to translate *kalū* and *āšipu* as “lamentation priest” and “incantation

priest” respectively, since this emphasises the cultic context which is crucial for understanding their intellectual output, and defines their primary role within the temple. On the *kalūs* and *āšipus* as “presumed *ērib-bītis*” see Van Driel 2002: 112–13; for the Late Babylonian interconnection between prebend-holding and cultic activities among *āšipus* and its lesser visibility at Uruk, see Jursa 1999: 27–31.

¹⁴ Appendix, Table F, Colophon 21.

¹⁵ Lenzi 2008: 204. I refer to what Lenzi calls a “*pāliḥ* formula” as a “*tabālu* formula”, since formulae beginning with *pāliḥ* can be completed by various verbs and I focus here on the *tabālu* type.

¹⁶ On divine revelation and human transmission of scholarly knowledge, see Lenzi 2008, Ch. 2.

¹⁷ Clancier 2009: 222–23.

This is confirmed by the time restrictions which appear in several *tabālu* colophons from Uruk, including that of the Iqīšāya tablet quoted above.¹⁸ Here, anyone who takes away the tablet is instructed to return it on the same or the following day, an injunction only explicable within an *intellectual* framework of short-term borrowing for consultation or copying. Even if one did wish to make a finer distinction between “material safety” and unauthorised use, theft, as expressed by the *tabālu* colophons, would surely come under the latter heading; in Babylonia one would not steal a tablet for want of clay. The *Geheimwissen* formulae can certainly be said to reflect a different emphasis from those which prohibit theft or extended borrowing; the former explicitly restrict access to the content to a group of users with specific intellectual qualifications, while the latter are concerned to ensure that the (unspecified) user returns the tablet safely to its rightful place without loss or neglect. However, I would argue that in all the formulae the core concern is to protect knowledge, and hence that, if we wish to investigate not only Mesopotamian scholarly conceptions of secrecy but also the protection of knowledge by Mesopotamian scholars more generally, then all tablets marked by protective formulae, not just the *Geheimwissen* type, can be classed as protected or restricted on intellectual grounds.

The evidence of surviving colophons yields two further points in support of this interpretation. The first relates to the frequency with which the different formulae appear. From Late Achaemenid and Seleucid Uruk there are only seven colophons containing *Geheimwissen* clauses, compared with around sixty with formulae of the *tabālu* type.¹⁹ The index to Hunger’s *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* reveals a similar distribution from other times and places, with *tabālu* clauses occurring three times as frequently as the phrase *mūdū mūdā likallim lā mūdū lā immar*, or variants thereof.²⁰ It seems unlikely that Mesopotamian scholars were relatively unconcerned about restricting access on an intellectual level compared with ensuring the material wellbeing of their tablets alone.

Secondly, the content of the colophons themselves offers further support for the dissolution of Lenzi’s distinction. Of seven Uruk colophons with *Geheimwissen* elements, certainly two and probably three also contain the *tabālu* formula.²¹ For example, the colophon fragment SpTU 4, 147 reads as follows:

^{md}inana-mu-kam dumu-[a-ni] | la ú-šam-kiš-šú ina te-šú ana é umun-šú hē-gur-šú šá t[um-šú im u] | ^dša-la lit-bal-šú zu ana zu-a li-kal-lim nu zu-a a-[a imur].

[...] Ištar-šuma-ēreš, [his] son [...] shall not let it be lost; on the same evening he should return it to the house of its owner. Whoever takes [it away], may [Adad and] Šala take him away. One who knows may show one who knows; one who does not know may not [see].

Lenzi contends that co-occurrences of this kind reinforce his distinction, since “the presence of the *pāliḥ DN u DN* formula... alongside the *Geheimwissen* colophon prevents us from identifying the former as a pious variant of the latter.”²² I would rather interpret the partial overlap in usage in the opposite sense, as an indication of a continuum of meaning and purpose between the *tabālu* and *Geheimwissen* clauses. This would be similar to the case of secrecy labels and other *Geheimwissen* phrases, which do not always appear together but seem to be parallel and mutually reinforcing and indeed are treated by Lenzi as such. There seems no obvious reason to interpret the co-occurrence of *tabālu* and *mūdū* clauses differently—quite the reverse, in fact, if we consider a number of cases where the punishment for the removal of a tablet is the removal of the offender’s eyesight. For example, one colophon from Neo-Assyrian Huzirina states:

ša ir ^d60 [...] igi^{II} meš-šú ir⁷ ša ina uru⁴ ú⁷-šam-[šu-u ina] šu^{II} dmuati ha-an-[tš]

Whoever takes (this tablet) away, may Ea, [...] take away his eyes. Whoever deliberately lets it be for[gotten, by] the hands of Nabû quick[ly...].²³

¹⁸ Appendix, Tables F and G, Colophons 19, 21, 24, 30, 32, 35, 36.

¹⁹ See Appendix, Tables E–H for all protected colophons discussed. *Geheimwissen* formulae occur in Colophons 32, 42 and 45.

²⁰ Hunger 1968, index s.v. *tabālu* and *idū*: 60 attestations of *tabālu* clauses against 16 for *mūdū* clauses.

²¹ Definite attestations are SpTU 4, 147 (Appendix, Colophon 32) and ACT 180 (not edited here as the family

affiliation is unknown). In ACT 135 (Colophon 45) the relevant clause breaks off after “*pāliḥ Anu Ellil u Ea*” but it is likely that the verb to be restored was the usual *lā itabbašū*.

²² Lenzi 2008: 204.

²³ STT 1, 40 r.22; transliteration and translation from the project *The Geography of Knowledge in Assyria and Babylonia* (henceforth GKAB): http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/cams/gkab/stt_1_40. Other examples of this punishment: BAM 1, IV, STT 1, 71; 84; STT 2, 215.

Given the importance of symmetry in the Mesopotamian prognostic and legal traditions, the clear implication is that the real offence is intellectual, i.e. taking the tablet in order to read the contents. A further link with knowledge can be seen in the appearance of Ea, god of wisdom, as divine avenger here and in other *tabālu* clauses.²⁴

Both methodological considerations and the textual evidence thus suggest strong reasons for abandoning Lenzi's artificial distinction between "material" and intellectual protective measures, and expanding the *Geheimwissen* corpus to a broader category of "protected texts" where in all cases some level of intellectual protection is involved, even if the link with knowledge is not made explicit on the verbal level. This not only makes more sense of the relative frequency of the various protective formulae within surviving colophons, but also yields a much larger number of protected texts, which may form a more coherent set or series of sub-groups. The rest of this study attempts to provide one example of how such coherence can indeed be traced, using as a test case the colophons of four groups of scholars from late Achaemenid and Seleucid Uruk.

II. The scholars of Late Babylonian Uruk

During the Late Babylonian period, cuneiform scholarship at Uruk was dynamic but tightly circumscribed. The surviving material reflects a scholarly environment dominated by a small group of families, many of whom were attached to the temples as *āšipus* and *kalûs*, "incantation priests" and "lamentation priests". The tendency towards familial monopoly was so strong that each of these professions came to be essentially restricted to a certain family: *āšipūtu* was monopolised in the Achaemenid period by the Šangû-Ninurtas, and in the Hellenistic period by the Ekur-zākirs, while the Sin-lēqi-unninni family had a tight grip on the position of *kalû*, which they had consolidated over several centuries.²⁵ It is the scholarly tablets belonging to members of these three families which will be considered here.²⁶ In terms of their provenance, the Uruk tablets fall into three sets which are not exactly coterminous with family groups.

The first corpus, or better, set of corpora, consists of 414 scholarly tablets discovered in a private house (the so-called "house(s) of the *āšipu* priests") during excavations by the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft from 1969 to 1972 in the square Ue XVIII.²⁷ These tablets belonged to the members of the Šangû-Ninurta and Ekur-zākir families, who served as *āšipus* in the late fifth and late fourth/early third centuries respectively. Although the two families' tablets seem originally to have been separate, located in different occupation levels, the site was disturbed by later Parthian graves; this, together with the fact that only 118 tablets have partially or fully preserved colophons, makes it impossible to assign many of the tablets securely to one family or the other.²⁸ However, among the tablets with colophons we can distinguish two sub-corpora belonging to the respective families:

- a) Šangû-Ninurta collection.²⁹ 39 tablets written and/or owned by three generations of the family from c. 425–400 B.C., of which 32 were owned by Šamaš-iddin or his son Anu-ikšur, and most of the others by Anu-ikšur's brother Rīmūt-Anu.
- b) Ekur-zākir collection. 46 tablets dating mainly from c. 325–300 B.C., of which 34 were owned or written by Iqīšāya or his son Ištar-šuma-ēreš.³⁰

²⁴ E.g. STT 1, 38; 2, 192 from Huzirina. At Uruk, Ea is invoked in conjunction with Anu and Ellil, on tablets of all types owned by Iqīšāya, and by other scholars usually on tablets which are connected with celestial phenomena. His specific aspect as a source of scholarly knowledge may therefore not be in play here. See Appendix, Colophons 18, 19, 21–23, 28, 30, 40, 42, 44–45.

²⁵ Beaulieu 2000: 5–8.

²⁶ The other two major scholarly families of Late Babylonian Uruk, Hunzû and Ahi'ûtu, are omitted since their surviving tablets are too few to draw conclusions about the distribution of colophons.

²⁷ Useful overviews: Clancier 2009: 30–32 and Robson 2008: 227–40; tablets published in SpTU I–V; partially re-edited by the GKAB project (<http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/cams/gkab>).

²⁸ For the most recent attempt to do so, and the difficulties involved, see Clancier 2009: 47–73.

²⁹ I avoid the problematic term "library" here due to lack of space to consider the methodological issues, although I regard it as justified to describe collections of scholarly cuneiform texts as "libraries" provided one is clear about the differences from Classical or modern libraries. For some recent terminological discussions, see Clancier 2009: 17–18; Too 2010; Robson 2013.

³⁰ Two Ekur-zākir scholarly tablets from 251 B.C. and 229 B.C. respectively were found in the house, suggesting continued occupation by the family during the third century, but most of their surviving tablets are from the late fourth century.

The second corpus consists of 141 scholarly tablets and 29 administrative texts discovered *in situ* in a small room inside the Rēš temple during German excavations in 1959–60.³¹ Many of the tablets were in poor condition, but most of the owners and scribes listed in the preserved colophons are *kalūs* of the Sîn-lēqi-unninni family. Particularly well-represented are Anu-bēlšunu (1) and his son Anu-aba-utēr, active during the late third and early second centuries.³²

Anu-bēlšunu and Anu-aba-utēr, as well as other members of the Sîn-lēqi-unninni and Ekur-zākir families, are also represented in the third corpus: around 175 scholarly tablets excavated illegally in the early 20th century. These tablets are unprovenanced but are likely to have come from the Rēš temple, and some at least from the area where the excavators later found the other Sîn-lēqi-unninni tablets, which had been disturbed by clandestine digging.³³ Of just over 70 tablets with fully or partially preserved colophons, most can be connected with the Ekur-zākir or Sîn-lēqi-unninni family; several tablets fall into both groups, since members of these two families sometimes collaborated.³⁴ The range of dated tablets spans the late fourth to the mid-second centuries; while Iqīšāya and his son appear in a few of these tablets, most of the Ekur-zākirs attested here are later generations.

The choice of these corpora has two main advantages for the current study. First, it yields a set of colophons, and a subset of colophons containing protective formulae, large enough to reveal trends but small enough for a single case study—rare within the surviving scholarly tablets from Mesopotamia. Second, the high proportion of archaeologically provenanced tablets, combined with our comparatively rich knowledge of the intellectual world of Late Babylonian Uruk, facilitates a more context-sensitive approach than has previously been followed with regard to the protective colophons. Instead of focusing on the content of protected tablets from different periods, the Uruk material allows us to examine the use of protective formulae among individuals operating within a similar intellectual, economic and social context, to some extent based on text groupings they themselves constructed. This enables us to look for smaller-scale patterns in the distribution of these formulae—professional, familial or individual. Such patterns are, I will argue, strongly present.

Before proceeding to an analysis of the material from Uruk, it must finally be stressed that even within this comparatively rich dataset there are many broken tablets. This often makes it difficult to tell whether or not a protective formula was originally present, and inevitably disrupts our identification and understanding of patterns. Nonetheless, I hope to demonstrate that the surviving colophons provide compelling evidence that the distribution of the protective formulae was far from random, and that protected knowledge and professional identity—at the level of the individual practitioner—are closely intertwined.

III. Protected knowledge and professional identity: the case of Uruk

Close examination of the Uruk colophons shows a strong correlation between the professional specialism(s) of the individual tablet owner and/or scribe, and the occurrence or non-occurrence of protective formulae in the colophon. A number of modern commentators have drawn a connection between secrecy and the scholarly professions; however, the link has so far been made at a high level of generality and/or using a model of a single, abstracted body of protected knowledge.³⁵ What the Uruk material demonstrates is that intellectual protection, and the mechanisms used to enforce it, are in fact highly context-dependent and tied to the individual intellectual practitioner, who marked with protective formulae tablets of special relevance to his own professional activity. For this reason it is impossible to find one criterion to explain the distribution of all protective formulae from multiple contexts, since the reasons for their application vary across time and space and even from one scholar to another.

To illustrate this link between profession and protection, we will first consider the Uruk *āšipus*. In order to work as far as possible from tablets grouped together in antiquity, the corpora from Ue

³¹ Tablets published in *BaM. Beih.* 2; discussion in Clancier 2009: 75–90.

³² On Anu-bēlšunu (1), see Beaulieu 2000; Pearce and Doty 2000.

³³ Tablets published in TCL 6, BRM 4 and ACT; partially

re-edited by the GKAB project (<http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/cams/gkab>). Colophons: Hunger 1968, nos. 87–118.

³⁴ ACT 163, 171, 300, 501, 600, 601, 702.

³⁵ E.g. Neugebauer 1955 I: 12; Rochberg 2004: 217; Lenzi 2008, Chs. 2–3.

XVIII form the primary dataset; the trends identified here are then tested using the illicitly excavated tablets.

i) *Safeguarding tradition: Achaemenid āšipūtu in the Šangū-Ninurta corpus.* Among the 39 tablets which can be securely attributed to the Šangū-Ninurta family by the colophon, 17 definitely contained a protective formula, almost all using the verb *tabālu* (a list of all tablets discussed here and an edition of the colophons containing protective formulae can be found in the Appendix, Tables A and E respectively). When the content of the protected tablets is examined, the vast majority can be related to the professional activity of the *āšipu*. Since there is a danger of over-generalisation or circular reasoning in attempting to identify the corpora of texts used by various types of scholar, it is worth defining at this point precisely the criteria by which a text is deemed to fall into this category. The fact that we possess a copy of a given composition belonging to an individual who self-identifies as an *āšipu* or *kalū* is not sufficient, since education, collaboration and individual intellectual interests may all result in scholars copying beyond the remit of their primary specialism. In the case of the *āšipus* we are in an easier position due to the existence of the so-called *Āšipu's Handbook* or *Manual of the Exorcist*.³⁶ This list of compositions that a would-be *āšipu* is to master as part of his training is known from the Neo-Assyrian period, but also from the Šangū-Ninurta tablet SpTU 5, 231, which proves that it was familiar to the *āšipus* of Achaemenid Uruk.³⁷ I take a given composition to be related to the *āšipus'* work if it meets one or more of the following conditions:

- The composition is listed in the *Āšipu's Handbook*.
- The composition falls under one of the *āšipu's* areas of competence as known from either the *Handbook* or other sources (e.g. medical texts, rituals, incantations).
- The *āšipu* is mentioned in the text itself (e.g. participating in a ritual).

Sixteen of the 17 protected tablets from the Šangū-Ninurta corpus contain compositions which qualify on these grounds. These are (colophons in Appendix, Table E):

- Nine tablets containing medical material (Colophons 1–9).³⁸
- Three copies of major incantation series or accompanying rituals: *Šurpu*, *Maqlū* and *Lamaštu* (Colophons 10–12).³⁹
- Two copies of the ritual series *Bīt Mēseri* (Colophons 13–14).⁴⁰
- One copy of the terrestrial omen series *Šumma Izbu* (Colophon 15).⁴¹
- One copy of the lexical commentary *ĪAR-gud* (Colophon 16).⁴²

The presence of a protective formula on the last tablet (Colophon 17) cannot be explained on the basis of a connection with *āšipūtu* in general, but its contents may have had particular significance for the *āšipus* of late Achaemenid Uruk. The tablet in question is a copy of the god-list An=*Anu*, a text which Beaulieu has persuasively argued may have influenced the reorganisation of the Uruk pantheon in the Late Babylonian period.⁴³ If this is so, the copy of An=*Anu* may have received a protective formula because of its special theological significance for these Šangū-Ninurta *āšipus*,

³⁶ First edition (KAR 44 only): Bottéro 1985; edition and critical discussion based on all MSS: Jean 2006: 62 ff. The Uruk MS SpTU 5, 231 was most recently edited by Clancier; online version at http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/cams/gkab/sptu_5_231. On the definition of *āšipūtu* and the activities of *āšipus*, with a focus on the Neo-Assyrian period, see Jean 2006.

³⁷ SpTU 5, 231 is broken but apparently a very close parallel to the Aššur copy KAR 44.

³⁸ Five of these are copies of or commentaries on the medical omen series Sa-gig, which is listed in the *Handbook* (KAR 44 o.6, broken on SpTU 5, 231). The other four medical texts cannot be matched to the *Handbook* but are clearly within the *āšipu's* professional remit. On late medical commentaries from Uruk, see George 1991; Geller 2010 Ch. 7; Frahm 2011: 220–29; 232–33.

³⁹ *Maqlū* and *Šurpu*: KAR 44 o.14; cf. SpTU 5, 231 o.14. *Lamaštu*: SpTU 5, 231 o.13.

⁴⁰ Cf. SpTU 5, 231 o.11; KAR 44 o.11.

⁴¹ Not listed in the *Handbook*, but included on analogy with *Šumma Alu*, which does appear.

⁴² Although *ĪAR-gud* is never referred to as *šātu* in subscripts (Frahm 2011: 58), as a bilingual commentary it may fall under the rubric of the “*šātu*-lists” mentioned in the *Handbook* (KAR 44 r.14; SpTU 5, 231 r.16; see Frahm 2011: 329 for the interpretation of nig-zi-gál-eden-na as “*šātu*-lists”). *ĪAR-gud* does not seem to have been used in elementary schooling during the first millennium (cf. Gesche 2001: 77; 179–82; 694; 809); as a composition apparently used only by those who already possessed a certain level of competence, it therefore seems a good candidate for the “*šātu*-lists” mentioned in the final section of the *Handbook* as material for those who have already “mastered the whole of *iššipūtu* and come to know the secret” (KAR 44 r.13; SpTU 5, 231 r.15).

⁴³ Beaulieu 2010.

who were active at precisely the time of transition between the old and new theology — as indicated by the shift from Anu and Ištar as the deities typically invoked in Šamaš-iddin's colophons to Anu and Antu in those of his son. In fact, this tablet itself appears to be one of the earliest to invoke Anu and Antu; it is one of only two tablets owned by Šamaš-iddin to use the new formula,⁴⁴ and was therefore written at exactly the point where, if Beaulieu's argument is correct, its contents may have been of most importance for the *āšipus* of Uruk.

The apparent correlation between the use of protective formulae and tablets containing compositions which had particular professional significance for the (Uruk) *āšipus* is striking. It can only be truly meaningful, however, if matched by a reverse correlation among the tablets which were *not* protected. How well do the unprotected tablets support the hypothesis that the fifth-century *āšipus* applied protective formulae only to compositions of core professional significance?

There are 16 tablets in the Šangû-Ninurta corpus which definitely do *not* contain protective formulae.⁴⁵ To a limited extent, these do show a distinction in content from the protected tablets. Three of the unprotected tablets are mathematical,⁴⁶ while, as we have seen, no mathematical composition appeared among the protected corpus. The absence of protective measures on this category of texts, which did not form an integral part of *āšipûtu*, supports the contention that the formulae were deliberately applied to compositions which were central to the Šangû-Ninurtas' professional activity. Yet beyond this the correlation between core professional texts and protective formulae seems to break down: the 13 remaining unprotected tablets contain very similar material to those which *were* protected—medical texts, incantations, omen series. On closer inspection, however, these unprotected tablets *can* be seen to differ from those that were protected. Although the content of both groups of tablets is thematically similar, in terms of the probable circumstances of their creation and use, the two groups show rather different profiles.

At least 10 of the 13 unprotected tablets which contain material related to *āšipûtu* can plausibly be viewed as the work of students or apprentices from the third stage of scribal education labelled by Gesche as "Fachausbildung", "specialised training."⁴⁷ As noted by Gesche, the identification of high-level educational texts is problematic and often depends on editors distinguishing relevant characteristics on an archive by archive basis.⁴⁸ However, all the tablets in this group display two or more of the following features associated with advanced pedagogical tablets:

- They are commentaries.⁴⁹
- Scribes who elsewhere bear the full professional title of *āšipu* appear here with no professional title or are designated as *šeḫru*, "junior".⁵⁰

⁴⁴ The other is SpTU 5, 254.

⁴⁵ See Appendix, Table A. On six tablets, damage to the colophon makes it impossible to determine whether a formula was originally present: SpTU 1, 28; 38; 44; 56; 60; SpTU 4, 151.

⁴⁶ SpTU 4, 172; 174; BaM. 21, 483.

⁴⁷ Gesche 2001: 213ff. Cf. Jursa 1999: II.6, who sees the Bēl-rēmāni archive as an example of *Fachausbildung*.

⁴⁸ Gesche 2001: 214.

⁴⁹ SpTU 1, 31; 32; 49; 50; 72; 83; SpTU 3, 99; 100. On the function of commentaries in advanced education, see Frahm 2011: 313–14. Of course, as Frahm notes, not all commentaries performed a pedagogical function, but in combination with other features such as a lack of professional titles this is a strong indicator. It may also be significant that none of the eight unprotected Šangû-Ninurta commentary tablets labeled *malsûtu* appears to be a copied text—none has a copying statement, catchline or *hepi*-glosses—while at least two of the four protected commentaries are copied works (SpTU 1, 33 has a catchline, and SpTU 5, 254 an explicit copying statement). This supports the idea that the unprotected commentaries were *ad hoc* interpretive aids by or for students which were not intended to be retained, unlike copied commentaries which were part of the body of professional knowledge transmitted from one generation to the next.

⁵⁰ No title: SpTU 1, 32; SpTU 3, 100; *šeḫru*: SpTU 1, 49; 50; 72; SpTU 3, 99 (restored). On professional titles qualified by *šeḫru* as an indication of (advanced) student status, see Gesche 2001: 214–15; Frahm 2011: 313. In the Hellenistic tablets from Uruk, where it is possible to trace the careers of individuals, *šeḫru* clearly represents a junior stage passed through by younger men before they received the full title of their profession—e.g. Anu-bēlšunu (I) appears as *kalû šeḫru*, "junior lamentation priest", in the colophon of TCL 6, 46, which he wrote in 231 B.C., whereas in all his later tablets he holds the title "*kalû* of Anu and Antu". In the Šangû-Ninurta corpus, however, it is not entirely unproblematic to understand *šeḫru* in this way, since Šamaš-iddin and Anu-ikšur are described as *āšipu šeḫru* on many of their surviving tablets, including cases where their own children are attested as scribes, i.e. far into adulthood. It is therefore possible that in this corpus, *šeḫru* is not the equivalent for *šamallû*, "apprentice", which it appears to be in the Hellenistic corpora (the title *šamallû* is only used once in the Late Babylonian scholarly colophons from Uruk, on TCL 6, 48)—although it is also possible that these two men began their careers later or progressed more slowly through the advanced levels of training (both of them hold the full title of *āšipu* on several tablets).

- They are designated with one of two labels frequently associated with a pedagogical setting: *malsûtu PN*, “reading of PN”,⁵¹ or *im-gid-da*, “long tablet”.⁵²
- There are errors in the manuscript, or a note by the scribe which suggests a struggling or inexperienced writer.⁵³
- The colophon is brief and contains neither ownership nor copying statements.⁵⁴

Although none of these features is in itself a wholly reliable indicator of a pedagogical context, when tablets exhibit clusters of them, the probability increases that we are dealing with the work of trainee or less experienced scribes. All ten of the tablets in this group show at least two of these features, and most exhibit three or more. As pedagogical exercises which for the most part are interpretive aids completed by students to enhance or demonstrate their own understanding of core reference works, these tablets were probably not intended to be kept for permanent reference or for circulation outside the teaching context; it is natural, therefore, that they would not be protected. Meanwhile, copies of core texts by established professionals or more advanced trainees were intended to function as reference works in themselves, and/or to form part of the future copying tradition. They received more elaborate colophons, with copying statements to guarantee their authenticity and textual history, and ownership statements and protective formulae to guarantee the restricted dissemination of their contents.

As the elision between “professionals” and “more advanced trainees” in the previous paragraph indicates, the correlation between pedagogical exercises and an absence of protective formulae is not absolute. Some of the protected tablets in the Šangû-Ninurta collection were also written/owned by self-identified “junior” *āšipus*, while at least two of the tablets which received protective formulae are marked *malsûtu Anu-ikšur*.⁵⁵ However, we should not expect absolute correlation here. In an intellectual environment where much of the actual copying of tablets seems to have been done by younger scholars under the supervision of more senior mentors or colleagues, the line between pedagogy and professional practice is inevitably blurred.⁵⁶ Advanced trainees might be called upon to produce reference copies, while all students would presumably have needed to practice copying and composing protective formulae as well as other colophon elements; these factors may explain the “junior” scribes on protected tablets and the protective formulae on tablets which show signs of being exercises. Moreover, although we know little about the workings of advanced training in *āšipûtu* or the other scholarly disciplines, it is safe to assume that the acquisition of specialist professional knowledge and skills did not happen overnight. It is likely that “junior” status covered

⁵¹ SpTU 1, 31; 32; 49; 50; 72; 83; SpTU 3, 99; 100. The exact nuances of *malsûtu* are still unclear (for recent discussions see Frahm 2010: 167–68, 178–79; Frahm 2011: 52). It is likely that the term is used to cover a range of scholarly activities; when used with a number and the name of a series (e.g. “56th *malsûtu* of *Šumma Alu*”), it seems to refer to a standardised section of the text, while its use with personal names suggests a more informal or personal act of “reading” or study. This semantic range does not necessitate a pedagogical framework, but since *malsûtu* frequently occurs on tablets where scribes appear with no professional title or are described as “junior” or “apprentice”, it is often taken as indicative of a pedagogical context (cf. Hunger 1976: 13; Gesche 2001: 214; Frahm 2010: 178; Geller 2010: 137–38). In the formula “*malsûtu PN*”, opinions vary as to whether the name indicates the student, completing a “reading” or “lesson” (Hunger 1976: 13; Gesche 2001: 214), or the teacher (“lecture of PN”: Geller 2010: 137–38). If Hunger is correct to suggest that the Šangû-Ninurta tablets marked *malsûtu Anu-ikšur* show a variety of hands (1976: 11–12), this might support the latter interpretation, but the fact that Anu-ikšur usually appears as “junior” or without a title in these tablets would seem to suggest that he himself is the student. A dedicated study of *malsûtu* tablets may clarify the issue; either way, it is reasonable to take the term as one indicator of pedagogy.

⁵² SpTU 1, 43; SpTU 5, 231. *im-gid-da* is clear in SpTU 1,

43; in SpTU 5, 231 von Weiher restores only [im ^m] but there is space for 4 signs. Like *malsûtu*, *im-gid-da* is not only used of curricular tablets, but these two tablets also contain errors and were written by unqualified or junior scribes. On the meanings of *im-gid-da* see Beaulieu 1992; Gesche 2001: 49–50; Lenzi 2008: 150–54; Frahm 2011: 29.

⁵³ Errors: SpTU 1, 43; SpTU 5, 231; note suggesting a struggling scribe: SpTU 1, 32 (*ul āmur*; cf. Frahm 2011: 40 and n. 148).

⁵⁴ Colophons tended to become more elaborate at more advanced levels of scholarship. For example, most of the 60 or so medical training exercises from the Bēl-rēmanni archive published in Finkel 2000 lack colophons altogether, and in only one tablet (one of the most advanced) is an individual named in the colophon. These tablets, although examples of *Fachausbildung*, attest a lower level of competence than those considered in the present study; the majority are short extracts, with rough handwriting and various errors.

⁵⁵ Appendix Table E: Colophons 2 and 4 (“junior”); Colophons 4 and 6 (*malsûtu*; also restored by Frahm in Colophon 5).

⁵⁶ On the “career path” in Late Babylonian Uruk whereby younger men appear as “scribe” and older scholars as “owner”, see further Pearce and Doty 2000: 336; Ossendrijver 2011.

a process lasting many months or even years, whose interim stages we cannot detect among undated tablets like those of the Šangû-Ninurta corpus. The *āšipū šehrûtu* who wrote the unprotected commentaries with their simple colophons may have been at the beginning of their professional training, while those responsible for protected copies of core professional texts were nearing the end.

It is also possible that thematic and pedagogical considerations were not the only ones which determined the presence or absence of protective formulae. As obliquely indicated several times above, another factor which separates the majority of the protected tablets from those that did not receive formulae is that most of the former are copies of the core works which formed the primary knowledge-base for *āšipûtu*, while the latter tend to be works of secondary scholarship which did not themselves belong to the copying tradition: commentaries, extracts or other works written as *ad hoc* interpretive or professional aids which seem to have been designed for personal or time-limited usage. Since hermeneutic exercises formed an important part of training, it is difficult to distinguish whether the status of the scribe or the status of the material is more salient; likely both have a role to play. The key seems to be that these 10 unprotected tablets, unlike those that were protected, do not appear to have been written for permanent retention or designed to function as part of a reference collection.

This leaves us with three more unprotected tablets which contain material from core reference works connected with *āšipûtu* but do not appear to be pedagogical exercises. Since the numbers are so small we may simply be dealing with natural deviations from the norm, but it is worth speculating slightly further, as it is also possible that we can trace here the first hint of a phenomenon that we will see reflected more strongly in the Ekur-zākir corpora: intellectual change. These three tablets contain material which, on the model proposed here, we might have expected to be protected: bilingual incantations and two copies of the royal purification ritual *Bīt Rimki*, “Bath House”, which is listed by name in the *Handbook*.⁵⁷ This leads to an important consideration. SpTU 5, 231 seems to be an almost exact parallel to KAR 44, which was written centuries earlier in very different intellectual and socio-political circumstances.⁵⁸ It is highly likely that both theoretical and practical aspects of the *āšipu*’s craft underwent alteration during the intervening period, with further variations due to the different locus of scholarship (royal court versus temple). Indeed, Jean has shown how few of the compositions listed in the *Handbook* are attested in Late Babylonian Uruk, especially in comparison with the collections of earlier first millennium *āšipus*.⁵⁹ Although the *Handbook* was still copied and considered relevant, some of the compositions within it may not have been available to the Uruk *āšipus*. Others survived but were no longer as integral to the discipline as they had once been, while new works had been created but would not be added to the list, due to the respect paid to the transmitted text.

In this light it is interesting that *Bīt Rimki* is one of the unprotected compositions from the *Handbook* at Uruk. Unlike their Neo-Assyrian counterparts, the *āšipus* of Achaemenid and Seleucid Uruk were unlikely to be called to assist with purification at the royal court. The ritual was clearly still copied, but perhaps was not protected because it was no longer part of the active core of knowledge on which *āšipus* prided themselves. Indeed, there are no copies of *Bīt Rimki* at all among the later third- and second-century tablets from Uruk. Of course this may all be due to the haphazard distribution of what survives, but it is also possible that we have here an illustration of the way in which, over time, compositions lost applicability and status and eventually ceased to be copied altogether.

In the Šangû-Ninurta corpus, there is no more than a hint of this process. The presence of the *Handbook* among their tablets, and the fact that the vast majority of their protected texts fall under its rubrics, shows that they were working, and locating themselves, within the traditional domains

⁵⁷ SpTU 4, 128; SpTU 3, 66; SpTU 4, 127. *Bīt Rimki* in the *Handbook*: KAR 44, o.11, probably to be restored in SpTU 5, 231 o.11.

⁵⁸ The close parallelism between the Neo-Assyrian and Uruk versions is, however, unsurprising given the other evidence for the enduring influence of Assyrian scholarship in later first-millennium Uruk (on which see Beaulieu 2010).

⁵⁹ Jean 2006: 165, although there are omissions in her table: *Bīt Rimki*, *Bīt Mēseri*, Ardat-lilī incantations, *nam-burba* rituals, *šu-il-la* prayers, *Sa-gig* and *Sa-gig-ga* are attested at Uruk, many of them listed by Jean in the preceding pages (163–64). Nonetheless, the contrast with earlier first-millennium collections is still significant.

of *āšipūtu* which went back for centuries. Some 100 years later, however, we see not only a confirmation of the close links between protective formulae and professional identity, but also further signs of the changes which were to transform the work of at least some *āšipus* before the end of cuneiform scholarship at Uruk.

ii) *Reinterpretation and innovation: Iqīšāya and Ištar-šuma-ēreš*. The distribution of protective formulae among the tablets owned and written by Ekur-zākir *āšipus* at the end of the fourth century B.C. supports the trends identified for the Šangū-Ninurtas.⁶⁰ We have a total of 47 tablets, of which five are too broken to affirm or deny the existence of a protective colophon.⁶¹ Fifteen tablets are definitely protected (their colophons are edited in Appendix, Table F). Unfortunately one is a fragment which only contains the colophon, so the composition to which it was attached is unknown.⁶² Twelve of the remaining 14 can be assigned to the professional domain of *āšipūtu*—although a somewhat different *āšipūtu* from that of the Šangū-Ninurta collection—using the criteria already identified:

- Four tablets containing incantations or associated rituals, from *Ušburruda* and *Muššu'ū* and against the demons Pazuzu and Ardat-lilī (Colophons 18–21).
- Three copies of or commentaries on terrestrial omen series (Colophons 22–24).
- One *namburbu* ritual (Colophon 25).
- Two tablets connected with building rituals in which the *āšipu* participated (Colophons 26–27).⁶³
- One calendar text including rituals for Du'ūzu, a month listed in the *Handbook* (Colophon 28).⁶⁴
- One tablet from the medical fumigation series *Qutāru* (Colophon 29).

This leaves two tablets. One is a hymn to Inana/Ištar (Colophon 30), perhaps protected because of its theological significance locally, even though Ištar had by this time been supplanted by Anu and Antu as principal deity of Uruk. We will return to the other below.

Patterns among the unprotected tablets help to reinforce the link between professional expertise and protective measures. The 25 unprotected tablets with colophons sufficiently well-preserved to permit analysis break down into two main groups.⁶⁵ As in the Šangū-Ninurta corpus, the first group comprises tablets which were probably not designed to be preserved or used for reference. Many can be connected with training, like the *malsūtu* tablets of Anu-ikšur—eleven can be assigned with relative confidence to this category, although the true number may be higher.⁶⁶ To these we may add four tablets which were written by titled scholars and contain excerpts from the major omen series. Such excerpts, *nishū*, unlike copies of the series proper, are not usually protected by Uruk scribes, and perhaps were not intended to form part of a permanent reference collection.⁶⁷ Again, a distinction between reference copies of core texts and extracts or commentaries seems to be in play here; the same may be the case for the unprotected tablet BRM 4, 20, an enigmatic composition which equates certain rituals with constellations and then continues with a commentary on what is apparently a different base text.⁶⁸

⁶⁰ Appendix, Tables B and F. I include here six illicitly excavated tablets owned by Iqīšāya or Ištar-šuma-ēreš, and omit two third-century SpTU tablets which are included with the later illicitly excavated tablets—see Appendix, n. 2.

⁶¹ SpTU 2, 18; SpTU 4, 133; 159; 188; SpTU 5, 240.

⁶² Table F, Colophon 32.

⁶³ Although temple building rituals are primarily connected with the *kalūš*, the brick ritual mentioned in SpTU 4, 141 o.4 appears in the *Handbook* (SpTU 5, 231 o.2).

⁶⁴ Cf. SpTU 5, 231 o. 5. The very similar tablet SpTU 3, 105, a calendar text for Araḥsamnu, is not protected; this tablet may be an exercise, since Iqīšāya does not have a title here (cf. n. 66), but it is also the case that Araḥsamnu is not one of the months listed in the *Handbook*, so the lack of protective formula may be to do with professional relevance.

⁶⁵ In SpTU 2, 39 and SpTU 3, 65 the beginning or middle

of the colophon is lost.

⁶⁶ In addition to *malsūtu* commentaries (in which the scribe is also often “junior” or without a title), I have included tablets in which the brief colophons and the scribe’s lack of titles or identification as junior may point towards a training exercise. *malsūtu*: SpTU 1, 90; SpTU 4, 162; TCL 6, 17. No titles: SpTU 1, 69; SpTU 2, 2; 5; 21; 35; SpTU 3, 105; SpTU 4, 162; TCL 6, 17; *šeḫru*: SpTU 3, 91.

⁶⁷ SpTU 2, 32; 33; 34 (*Šumma Alu* excerpts); TCL 6, 9 (omens of the *akītu* festival). One *nishū* tablet, SpTU 3, 97, appears among those with protective colophons. Excerpts may have been part of training (especially in the case of excerpt series which entered the copying tradition) or *ad hoc* extracts by scholars.

⁶⁸ On this tablet, see Frahm 2011: 31 and 128, with bibliography.

Parallel to the mathematical tablets in the Šangû-Ninurta corpus, a second group of six tablets contains material unrelated to the traditional role of the *āšipu* as defined above: zodiacal astrology, and lexical and extispicy texts. On the model proposed here we would not expect these to receive protective measures, and they do not.⁶⁹ However, the presence at all of some of these types of text, which do not occur in the Šangû-Ninurta corpus, suggests a shift in intellectual interests which is borne out among the other unprotected and protected tablets.

As noted above, the protected tablets owned by Iqīšāya and his son do not overlap completely in content with those of their predecessors. While *namburbu* rituals and various incantation texts occur in both corpora, conspicuous by their absence among the Ekur-zākir tablets are the medical compositions which formed the core of the Šangû-Ninurta protected collection, in particular Sa-gig and its commentaries. In fact, only one copy of Sa-gig can be definitely attributed to the Ekur-zākirs, compared with at least 11 Šangû-Ninurta copies.⁷⁰ Furthermore, that single tablet is unprotected, along with two others which also contain *āšipūtu* texts as defined by the traditional model: physiognomic omens and an incantation ritual.⁷¹ The numbers are so small as to make any inference tentative, but here we perhaps have a glimpse of a similar process to that which we postulated for *Bīt Rimki* in the Šangû-Ninurta collection. It may not be too fanciful to see in the fourth-century Ekur-zākirs' tablets signs of a move away from some aspects of traditional medicine, especially given the family's interest in the new discipline of zodiacal astrology, which could lead to alternative means of diagnosis and treatment.⁷² Although these new bodies of knowledge were not yet of core importance to the *āšipus'* professional activity, they may have facilitated or accompanied a re-examination of traditional theory and practice by which some of the older diagnostic tools, including medical and other terrestrial omens, were reinterpreted (one reason for the proliferation of Late Babylonian commentaries on these series) or replaced.

Into this context of reinterpretation we may fit the final protected tablet among the Ekur-zākir collection, which is of a type we would not have expected an *āšipu* to protect: a copy of so-called dub ḥa-la omens from the extispicy series *Bārūtu*.⁷³ Not only was liver divination never the preserve of the *āšipus*, it was no longer an organised discipline by this period, and indeed the Šangû-Ninurtas a century before seem not to have used the *Bārūtu* series at all. Why, then, were Iqīšāya and his son, who also owned another part of the series, interested in it?⁷⁴ One of the other tablets written by Iqīšāya may provide the key. SpTU 4, 159 contains a text which links ominous areas of the liver to zodiacal constellations. It seems as if we have here an attempt to revive or reinterpret a practically obsolete, yet antique and therefore high status tradition by mapping it onto a new discipline which was rapidly growing in prominence and in which, as we have seen, the Ekur-zākir *āšipus* were beginning to invest: zodiacal astrology. As Babylonian intellectual activity was transformed by the rise of the zodiac and mathematical astronomy, the following centuries were to see various experiments in reinterpretation and synthesis of this type, such as texts which connected magical stones and plants with degrees of the zodiac. Already one of the Ekur-zākirs' other protected tablets, the calendar text SpTU 3, 104 (Colophon 28) links zodiacal astrology to the ritual calendar, as does the unprotected SpTU 3, 105.⁷⁵ Although the bulk of their protected tablets still fall within the

⁶⁹ Zodiacal astrology (nb. *Enūma Anu Ellil* appears in the *Āšipu's Handbook*, so traditional astrology could be part of *āšipūtu*, although we see no sign of it among the Šangû-Ninurta tablets): SpTU 1, 94; 96; SpTU 2, 43; SpTU 5, 265. Some of these are labelled im-gid-da and may be exercise tablets, but the use of titles and ethnics invites caution. Lexical: SpTU 2, 51; extispicy: SpTU 1, 80.

⁷⁰ SpTU 2, 44. There are around 20 medical tablets without colophons from the house which cannot be definitely attributed to either family; Clancier (2009: 387 ff.) assigns most to the Šangû-Ninurtas.

⁷¹ SpTU 4, 150; SpTU 5, 245.

⁷² Iatromathematics certainly became an important discipline in the broader Hellenistic world. Apart from the tablets listed in n. 69, the equation of constellations with rituals in BRM 4, 20 and the use of the zodiac in the calendar texts

SpTU 3, 104 and SpTU 3, 105 are further witnesses to the Ekur-zākirs' developing interest in celestial phenomena. This sign of "Hellenistic tastes" and the contrast with the interests of earlier *āšipus* are also remarked by Jean 2006: 162. No astrological texts, zodiacal or otherwise, are attested in the Šangû-Ninurta corpus.

⁷³ Appendix Table F, Colophon 31.

⁷⁴ The other tablet is SpTU 1, 80 which, although it does not contain a recognisable protective formula and is classed as "unprotected", has the enigmatic series of signs LÁ-LÁ-LÁ at the end of the colophon. The same set of signs may occur on several of the Rēš tablets, e.g. *BaM. Beih.* 2, 90 and 103 (where the "verso" seems to contain a colophon). Perhaps this represents some kind of protective mechanism.

⁷⁵ Robson 2011: 568. On SpTU 3, 105 cf. n. 64.

traditional sphere occupied by the Šangû-Ninurtas, Iqīšāya and his son are also the forerunners of the Hellenistic *āšipus*, many of whom would look increasingly towards the heavens.

iii) *Hellenistic interdisciplinarity: āšipūtu in the age of celestial inquiry*⁷⁶. In this and the following sections we move from the private house Ue XVIII to the Rēš temple, the likely source of both provenanced and unprovenanced texts belonging to the Seleucid *āšipus* and *kalūs*. Here the proportion of training texts seems to be much smaller, which enables us to highlight more clearly the link between the respective professions and their protected corpora. However, since a typology for training exercises in astronomical material is not well-established, identifying different levels of expertise is difficult here, and distinctions are relative rather than absolute. Some tablets where various criteria suggest a more junior writer will be indicated, but this is likely to be an underestimate.

Ekur-zākir *āšipus* appear as owner, scribe or both in the colophons of 33 tablets from the third and early second centuries.⁷⁷ The content of both protected and unprotected tablets provides striking testimony to the continuation of the intellectual changes which we identified as nascent in the fifth and fourth centuries: nearly half are astronomical or astrological, while *Bārūtu* texts make up the next largest group (nine tablets), illustrating the revival of the series or some of its parts among these scholars. The distribution of protective formulae also bears witness to the changes, with the content of the eight protected tablets now split between traditional *āšipūtu* and the new areas of interest as follows (colophons edited in Appendix, Table G):

- Two tablets related to ritual activity: New Year rituals and a hymn to Anu (Colophons 33–34).
- Two tablets dealing with terrestrial omen series—*Šumma Izbu* and *Bārūtu* (Colophons 35–36).
- One tablet of traditional astrology (*Enūma Anu Ellil*, Colophon 37).
- Two tablets of mathematical astronomy (Colophons 38–39).
- One calendar text using the zodiac (Colophon 40).

There are no medical tablets, although this may be due to the different intellectual context.⁷⁸ It is tempting to conclude from the protected texts alone that the new celestial sciences and *Bārūtu* had become a central part of the knowledge connected with *āšipūtu*. However, an examination of the unprotected tablets suggests that the situation is more complex, for the majority of these—14 out of 20 tablets—also contain material relating to *Bārūtu*, mathematical astronomy or zodiacal astrology.⁷⁹ Have we at last run up against the fabled inconsistency of the protective colophons?

I do not believe so. In this case we need to look for coherence at the level of the individual practitioner, and to make more of a distinction between owner and scribe. While each of the corpora from Ue XVIII were dominated by only two scholars, and owner and scribe came from the same family and profession, at least nine different individuals, including members of other families, were involved in the creation of the tablets owned and/or written by the Seleucid Ekur-zākirs. It is natural that the material will be less homogeneous given the various specialisms and individual interests involved. When we group the tablets according to their owner and scribe, greater clarity emerges (Table 1, overleaf).

A number of apparent inconsistencies are now resolved. First of all, the owner of the protected *Bārūtu* copy turns out to be from the Aḫi'ūtu family; the Ekur-zākir link here is through the scribe. The owner was not an *āšipu*, and perhaps had different scholarly interests which led to the use of the

⁷⁶ Following Rochberg, I use the terms “celestial inquiry” and “celestial science” to cover the different but interconnected components of Mesopotamian study of the heavens that fall into different modern categories. On the integration of astronomical and astrological material in Mesopotamian celestial science and for a justification of the use of “science” in this context, see Rochberg 2004: 11–43.

⁷⁷ Appendix, Table C.

⁷⁸ Although it is often stated that there is little difference in the composition of private and temple collections in Uruk,

compared with those from Ue XVIII the temple tablets reflect a not unexpected focus on ritual, as opposed to diagnosis or healing. Cf. Jursa 1999: 29–30 for such a distinction between cultic activities and “freelance” magical-medical work among the *āšipus*.

⁷⁹ Appendix, Table C. Five broken tablets where it is impossible to be certain about the presence of protective formulae are excluded from consideration: ACT 300, 601, 651, 803 and UCP 9: 398 ff.

TABLE 1: Protected and unprotected Ekur-zākir tablets, by owner and scribe.⁸⁰

| <i>Tablet</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Scribe</i> | <i>Prot.?</i> |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| BRM 4, 7 | New year rituals | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Anu-balassu-iqbi s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | Y |
| UVB 15, 37 | Hymn/prayer to Šin | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Anu-balassu-iqbi s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | N |
| SpTU 1, 2 | Chronicle (Šulgi) | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Anu-balassu-iqbi s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | N |
| BRM 4, 8 | Bilingual hymn to Anu | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Anu-ušallim s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | Y |
| TCL 6, 19 | Astrological weather forecasts | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Ina-qibīt-Anu s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | N |
| K. 3753 | Calendar text (astrological) | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | Y |
| BRM 4, 13 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 2 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 3 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 4 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 35 | <i>Erimḫuš</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| BRM 4, 12 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-uballiṭ s. Nidinti-Anu d. Hunzû | N |
| TCL 6, 16 | <i>Enûma Anu Ellil 56</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-uballiṭ s. Nidinti-Anu d. Hunzû | N |
| TCL 6, 5 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Ina-qibīt-Anu s. Nidinti-Anu d. Hunzû | N |
| ACT 101 | Lunar ephemeris: new moons | Ina-qibīt-Anu s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| ACT 163 | Lunar auxiliary table: full moons | Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu d. Šin-lēqi-unninni | Y |
| ACT 171 | Lunar auxiliary table: full moons | Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu d. Šin-lēqi-unninni | N |
| ACT 600 | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter | Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu d. Šin-lēqi-unninni | Y |
| TCL 6, 15+ | <i>Enûma Anu Ellil</i> catalogue | Anu-aḫa-iddin s. Nidinti-Anu | = owner | Y |
| TCL 6, 7 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | X s. X d. Ekur-zākir | X s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| SpTU 4, 157 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | X s. X d. Ekur-zākir | Ša-Anu-iššu s. Ištar-šuma-ēreš | N |
| TCL 6, 1 | <i>Bārūtu</i> | Anu-balassu-iqbi s. Anu-aḫa-ittannu d. Aḫi'ūtu | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Y |
| ACT 501 | Planetary auxiliary table: Mars | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu d. Šin-lēqi-unninni | Anu-uballiṭ s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| ACT 702 | Planetary ephemeris: Saturn | [Anu-aba-utēr s.] Anu-bēlšunu d. Šin-lēqi-unninni | [Anu-uballiṭ s.] Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 39 | New year rituals | Anu-uballiṭ s. Nidinti-Anu d. Hunzû | Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 38 | Daily offerings | = scribe | Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 10 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> varia | X s. X d. X | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Y |
| ACT 161 | Lunar auxiliary table: full moons | X s. X d. X | X s. X s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | N |

⁸⁰ "s." = "son of"; "d." = "descendant of" (descendant of Ekur-zākir if not otherwise stated).

protective formula on the tablet written for him; all the *Bārûtu* copies owned by Ekur-zākirs are unprotected.⁸¹ Thus, although the *āšipus* were interested in the series, as a rule among copies they owned they did not protect it—no inconsistency, or dramatic shift, here. Another apparent inconsistency is in the treatment of New Year rituals: BRM 4, 7 and TCL 6, 39 contain very similar material but the former is protected and the latter is not. Although TCL 6, 39 was owned by an individual from the Ħunzû rather than Ekur-zākir family, he was also an *āšipu*, so we cannot invoke different professional specialisms as an explanation here. However, in this case a closer look at the content of the two texts reveals an important difference. BRM 4, 7 relates a part of the *akîtu* festival which involves the *āšipus* at every stage; in contrast, the rituals of TCL 6, 39 do mention the *āšipus* occasionally but the dominant cultic personnel here are the *kalûs*, diviners and musicians. Once more, the text with the stronger connection to the *āšipus*' professional specialism is the one which is protected. This trend is borne out by the other tablets. Omens from or similar to *Šumma Izbu*, New Year rituals and a hymn to Anu are protected, all of which are more closely connected with the Ekur-zākirs' duties as Uruk *āšipus* than the astrological weather forecasts, literary and lexical texts and hymn to Sin which are left unprotected.

TCL 6, 38, written by Šamaš-ēṭir and containing information on daily offerings in Uruk, is another apparent exception and an interesting case, since its colophon is very unusual. The first atypical feature is the description of the source from which the tablet was copied. While various tablets are labelled as containing material "in the domain of" a certain profession, this original was apparently rather encyclopaedic, containing:

...the rites of *Anûtu*, the purification rituals and rites of kingship, including the purification rituals for the gods of the Rēš, Irigal and Eanna and (other) temples of Uruk; the activities of the *āšipus*, *kalûs* and cultic singers and all the scholars who are after the...not forgetting everything that concerns an apprentice scholar.⁸²

The purpose of this hyperbolic claim becomes clear when we read on. The colophon states that this writing board itself was a copy of original tablets which had been looted from Uruk centuries previously and taken to Elam. There, a recent ancestor of the scribe had seen and copied them in the early Seleucid period, bringing back the copies to Uruk. This is usually treated as fictional autobiography, although it is possible that an early Seleucid scribe could have travelled east and discovered looted tablets, just as modern archaeologists found much looted material at Susa. In any case, the narrative must be recounted to glorify the scribe's family. Yet why the exceptional colophon, and why not protect a tablet which contained cultic material of direct relevance to the professional activity of the *āšipu*? One explanation suggests itself which would account for both. TCL 6, 38 has no separate owner listed, and the scribe, Šamaš-ēṭir, does not have a title. There is also no date, or copying statement ("written and checked"). These features, the excursus into family history, and the unexpected stress on the apprentice ("not forgetting everything which concerns the apprentice scholar") combine to suggest that this tablet was written by Šamaš-ēṭir at an earlier part of his training, like many of the unprotected tablets belonging to his fourth-century relatives. We would not then expect a protective formula, although a great deal of pride in his family's scholarly reputation (or the reputation he was seeking to construct) is certainly in evidence.

So far, all this is quite similar to the situation we found in the earlier Ekur-zākir corpus, and conforms to our proposed model: the material of core relevance to the owner's professional interests is what was protected. The real change is with the celestial sciences, traditional and non-traditional. These now loom large among the protected tablets, but may still seem, based on Table 1 alone, to be treated rather inconsistently. Not every scholar protected all, or any, of the astrological or astronomical material he owned or wrote, nor did all scholars protect the same types of text. For example, Nidinti-Anu and Ina-qibīt-Anu owned unprotected copies of *Enûma Anu Ellil* and a lunar ephemeris, while similar tablets belonging to Anu-aḥa-iddin, Anu-aḥa-ušabši and Šamaš-ēṭir were protected.

⁸¹ I do not include as protected SpTU 4, 157. Here, in the last line of the reverse, before the colophon which is on the lower edge, the phrase "secret of extispicy" qualifying dub ḥa-la seems to be part of the title, and there is no verbal

clause containing a protective formula. If one does take this tablet as protected it does not disrupt the general trends identified here.

⁸² TCL 6, 38 r. 44-46.

TABLE 2: Celestial science within the Ekur-zākir corpus.

| Tablet | Description | Owner | Scribe | Prot.? |
|------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------|
| K. 3753 | Calendar text (astrological) | **Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | *Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | Y |
| TCL 6, 19 | Astrological weather forecasts | *Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Ina-qibīt-Anu s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | N |
| ACT 101 | Lunar ephemeris: new moons | Ina-qibīt-Anu s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | N |
| TCL 6, 16 | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> 56 | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-uballiṣ s. Nidinti-Anu d. Ḫunzû | N |
| ACT 163 | Lunar auxiliary table: full moons | **Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | *Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu d. Sîn-lēqi-unninni | N |
| ACT 171 | Lunar auxiliary table: full moons | *Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | **Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu d. Sîn-lēqi-unninni | Y |
| ACT 600 | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter | *Šamaš-ēṭir s. Ina-qibīt-Anu | *Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu d. Sîn-lēqi-unninni | Y |
| TCL 6, 15+ | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> catalogue | Anu-aḫa-iddin s. Nidinti-Anu | [**Anu-aḫa-ušabši] | Y |

In fact this is not a coincidence. While all five men were *āšipus*, the latter three also held another title which Nidinti-Anu and Ina-qibīt-Anu did not possess: *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil*, “scribe of (the celestial omen series) *Enūma Anu Ellil*”, which identifies them as experts in what we would call astronomy and astrology.⁸³ In Late Babylonian Uruk, this title is held by a number of individuals whose primary occupation was *āšipu* or *kalû*; it was a specialism which cut across familial and professional lines, which explains the apparently inconsistent treatment of astronomical and astrological texts by the Ekur-zākirs. Once we take into consideration their differing expertise in this area, the distribution of protective formulae is much more comprehensible. Table 2 lists the tablets relating to celestial science which belonged to the Ekur-zākirs; individuals known to have held the title *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil* are indicated by one star, and those identified as such on the tablet in question by two stars.⁸⁴

As the table illustrates, all the astrological and astronomical tablets marked with protective formulae were owned and/or written by celestial specialists. We will return to the question of why specialists did not protect all such material in the discussion of the Sîn-lēqi-unninni tablets below, but it is possible to make a few comments here about the two unprotected astrological and astronomical tablets which *did* belong to Ekur-zākir scribes of *Enūma Anu Ellil*: TCL 6, 19 (astrological weather forecasts, owned by Anu-aḫa-ušabši), and ACT 163 (a lunar auxiliary table, owned by Šamaš-ēṭir and written by Anu-aba-utēr).

In the case of TCL 6, 19, we have already noted that weather forecasts were less closely connected with Anu-aḫa-ušabši’s cultic duties than some of his other tablets, and the same explanation may remain relevant here. The Ekur-zākirs were *āšipus* first, celestial scholars second, and they may have guarded most closely the aspects of their new area of competence which were of most use to the old. Charting the movements of celestial bodies which were believed to have ominous significance would perhaps have been of greater relevance for diagnostic and therapeutic aspects of the *āšipu*’s art than the astrological weather forecasts.

This leaves ACT 163, which at first glance presents a problem—it is a lunar auxiliary table, just like the protected ACT 171, and both tablets were owned and written by Šamaš-ēṭir and Anu-aba-utēr, both celestial specialists. Here, however, an explanation may be found in context rather than content. ACT 163 is the only one among the surviving tablets Anu-aba-utēr wrote for Šamaš-ēṭir (to whom he was apprenticed for instruction in celestial subjects) where he does not hold any

⁸³ On the *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil* see McEwan 1981: 16; Rochberg 1993, 2000; Van Driel 2002: 98; Boiy 2004: 268; 272–73; Beaulieu 2006.

⁸⁴ To avoid repetition, tablets written by Ekur-zākirs for Sîn-lēqi-unninni are discussed in Section iv) below (they are listed in both families’ corpora in the Appendix).

professional title, either as *kalû* or *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil*. On the other three tablets, which are probably later than ACT 163 and at least two of which are protected (the other is broken), Anu-aba-utēr always has one or more titles; moreover, two of the other tablets are dated, whereas ACT 163 is not. This tablet may therefore represent an earlier stage in his training, which might explain the absence of a protective colophon.⁸⁵

Overall, then, there is no inconsistency, merely patterns created by the opposing forces of tradition and innovation. While some Ekur-zākir *āšipūtu* continued to focus on and protect the types of text associated with traditional *āšipūtu*, those who also qualified as *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil* combined their traditional knowledge of the discipline with a specialism in Hellenistic celestial science, and took pains to guard the knowledge of their secondary area of expertise also. The case of astronomy and astrology turns out to be the apparent exception that proves the link between professional expertise and protection.

iv) *Lamentation and lunar theory: the Sîn-lēqi-unninni kalûs*. Contemporaries of, and in some cases collaborators with, the Seleucid Ekur-zākirs were the Sîn-lēqi-unninni *kalûs*, whose tablets form the final set for our case study. Tablets from both authorised and illicit excavations will be drawn upon here, since they involve the same set of individuals; it should be borne in mind, however, that some of these tablets probably belonged to different collections in antiquity.⁸⁶

Unfortunately, many of the Sîn-lēqi-unninni tablets are severely damaged, leaving us with 29 tablets which can definitely be classed as protected or unprotected.⁸⁷ In analysing these we are in a more difficult position than with *āšipūtu*, since we have no “handbook” for *kalûtu* by which to judge a given composition’s relevance to the discipline, and must depend to a greater extent on indications within texts or inferences based on our general knowledge of the *kalûs*’ role from other sources.⁸⁸ To avoid repetition of tablets from the previous section, only the 24 tablets owned by Sîn-lēqi-unninni *kalûs* will be considered here.⁸⁹ However, this is by no means intended to imply that the owner’s professional identity is always more relevant than that of the scribe for understanding the protective formulae, especially in cases where the two have different familial or professional affiliations. The relative influence of owner and scribe on colophon elements in general is an issue that deserves further investigation, but both seem have a role to play in explaining the distribution of the protective colophons. For example, as we saw above, in the case of the protected *Bārûtu* tablet written by Nidinti-Anu for Anu-balassu-iqbi of the Aḥi’ūtu family, the fact that the owner was not an *āšipu* may have determined the application of a protective formula.⁹⁰ Meanwhile, with the Ekur-zākir celestial tablets the identity of the scribe may have been more salient: those which bear protective formulae were always written, but not always owned, by celestial specialists.

Six of the seven protected tablets owned by Sîn-lēqi-unninnis fall neatly into two categories which Beaulieu associates with their profession: texts directly connected with their ritual activity, and texts connected with celestial phenomena (colophons in Appendix, Table H).⁹¹ The first group comprises:

- Two copies of the kettledrum ritual, performed by the *kalûs* during lunar eclipses (Colophons 41–42).
- One lamentation (Colophon 43).

⁸⁵ It may also be relevant that ACT 163 is a less complex auxiliary table than ACT 171.

⁸⁶ Clancier suggests that the ACT tablets formed a separate collection at the Rēš, accessible to both Ekur-zākirs and Sîn-lēqi-unninnis (2009: 79; 101).

⁸⁷ Appendix, Table D lists all tablets attributable to the Sîn-lēqi-unninni family on the basis of the colophon. Broken tablets excluded from discussion in this section: ACT 165; 300; 601; 800a; 1032; TCL 6, 54; 57; *BaM. Beih.* 2, 65; 86; 109; VAT 7816.

⁸⁸ On *kalûtu* see Beaulieu 2000: 13, n. 37.

⁸⁹ In addition to the four tablets written by Anu-aba-utēr for Šamaš-ēṣir which were treated in Section iii), the protected tablet TCL 6, 32, written by Anu-bēlšunu for a member of the Aḥi’ūtu family, is omitted from consideration. ACT 192, where only the name of the scribe is preserved, is retained since this tablet is a votive and usually in such cases owner and scribe are the same.

⁹⁰ TCL 6, 1.

⁹¹ Beaulieu 2000: 12.

In the second group are:

- The microzodiac TCL 6, 12+ (Colophon 44).⁹²
- Two astronomical tablets (Colophons 45–46).

Once again, we will return to the final protected tablet later. The connection of the first group with the *kalûs*' professional activity is clear, and so we may move on to consider the second. Beaulieu and others have argued persuasively that the *Sîn-lēqi-unninni*'s interest in mathematical astronomy may have arisen from a desire to predict celestial phenomena more accurately, in order to time rituals correctly.⁹³ This alone would allow us to explain the second group of tablets in general terms, but a closer examination of both protected and unprotected celestial material renders it possible to make some more nuanced distinctions. Table 3 lists the protected and unprotected astronomical and astrological tablets owned by the *Sîn-lēqi-unninni kalûs* (individuals identified as *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil* are once more distinguished by stars; family affiliation is *Sîn-lēqi-unninni* unless otherwise stated).

TABLE 3: Celestial science within the *Sîn-lēqi-unninni* corpus.

| Tablet | Description | Owner | Scribe | Prot.? |
|------------|---|---|---|--------|
| ACT 102 | Lunar ephemeris: new moons, last visibility, full moons | Anu-bēlšunu s. Nidinti-Anu | **Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | N |
| ACT 135 | Lunar ephemeris: eclipses | Anu-bēlšunu s. Nidinti-Anu | **Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | Y |
| ACT 400 | Planetary ephemeris: Venus | Anu-bēlšunu s. Nidinti-Anu | *Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu ⁹⁴ | N |
| ACT 640 | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter | Anu-bēlšunu s. Nidinti-Anu | *Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu ⁹⁵ | N |
| A 3405 | Table of planetary phases | Anu-bēlšunu s. Nidinti-Anu | **Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | N |
| TCL 6, 12+ | Microzodiac | Anu-bēlšunu s. Nidinti-Anu | **Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | Y |
| VAT 7815 | Calendar text for Kislîmu | Anu-bēlšunu s. Nidinti-Anu | **Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | N |
| ACT 802 | Procedure text for Saturn | *Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | = owner | N |
| ACT 194 | Lunar auxiliary table: daily positions | **Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-balassu-iqbi, nephew of owner | Y |
| ACT 501 | Planetary ephemeris: Mars | *Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu | Anu-uballiṭ s. Ina-qibīt-Anu d. Ekur-zākir | N |
| ACT 702 | Planetary ephemeris: Saturn, oppositions | [**Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu] | [Anu-uballiṭ] s. Ina-qibīt-Anu d. Ekur-zākir | N |
| ACT 174 | Lunar auxiliary table: full moons | [*Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēlšunu] ⁹⁶ | [Anu-uballiṭ s. Ina-qibīt-Anu] d. Ekur-zākir | N |
| ACT 192 | Lunar auxiliary table: daily positions | X s. X d. <i>Sîn-lēqi-unninni</i> | = owner? | N |

⁹² Beaulieu does not mention TCL 6, 12+, as his category is “astronomical” texts. Since the microzodiac contains ritual instructions it could equally have been placed in the first group.

⁹³ Beaulieu 2000: 7–8.

⁹⁴ The tablet is damaged where a title might have been written.

⁹⁵ The tablet is damaged where a title might have been written.

⁹⁶ Restorations of owner and scribe are based on two considerations. First, in the other cases where an Ekur-zākir copies for a *Sîn-lēqi-unninni*, the owner-scribe pair is Anu-aba-utēr and Anu-uballiṭ. Second, the tablet is dated to SE 124, the same year as ACT 501, written by Anu-uballiṭ for Anu-aba-utēr, and 702, where Neugebauer restores Anu-aba-utēr and Anu-uballiṭ (1955 I: 20).

Looking for celestial specialists will once again take us some way here. All the protected astrological and astronomical tablets were owned or written by Anu-aba-utēr, who held the title *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil*. Yet this still leaves a large number of unprotected tablets in which Anu-aba-utēr is either owner or scribe. Since in this case we are dealing with a particularly small number of protected tablets, any conclusions must be tentative. However, one further element to explain the distribution suggests itself, namely a link between the Sîn-lēqi-unninnis' primary and secondary areas of expertise: the celestial phenomena on the protected tablets are arguably those of most precise relevance to the *kalūs'* ritual activity. This is perhaps easiest to see for the microzodiac TCL 6, 12+, which explicitly includes cultic instructions. Yet this and the protected astronomical tablets also share another element which distinguishes them from the bulk of the unprotected tablets: a connection with the moon, and specifically with lunar eclipses, around which an important part of the *kalūs'* ritual activity was centred. The microzodiac opens with a description of a lunar eclipse, and later in the text omens which signify an eclipse are given. Meanwhile, the protected astronomical tablets owned by the *kalūs* treat lunar phenomena which are either directly connected with eclipses, in the case of the ephemeris ACT 135, or could be used to predict the movements of the moon, and hence to assess eclipse possibilities. In contrast, planetary ephemerides or auxiliary tables, of less relevance to the *kalūs'* ritual activity, were not protected.

The focus on the moon among the protected texts confirms Beaulieu's insights into the likely purpose behind the *kalūs'* interest in astronomy, and supports the suggestion made above regarding the Ekur-zākir celestial tablets: that protective formulae were applied to those tablets of core relevance to each specialist's primary occupation. This interpretation is strengthened further by the way in which the distribution of protective formulae differs between the *āšipus'* and *kalūs'* celestial tablets. One of the unprotected astrological tablets written by Anu-aba-utēr is a calendar text, a type of composition which the Ekur-zākirs did protect. Similarly, although no protected planetary astronomy was owned by the *kalūs*, Anu-aba-utēr wrote a protected copy of a planetary ephemeris for Šamaš-ēṭir of the Ekur-zākir family, perhaps in line with the latter's diagnostic and therapeutic interests which the *kalūs* did not share. A similar interaction between the interests of owner and scribe might also explain the distribution of protective formulae on lunar tablets written by Anu-aba-utēr for his father, who was not himself a *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil*.⁹⁷ Here, the two protected celestial tablets are the two in which the connection with *kalūtu* is most direct—the microzodiac, and the ephemeris ACT 135 which deals specifically with lunar eclipses. The other lunar ephemeris owned by Anu-bēlšunu, ACT 102, does not deal with eclipses directly, making it less relevant for a *kalū* who lacked expertise in celestial science; perhaps this is why it is left unprotected.

There is of course an unprotected tablet relating to lunar phenomena which *was* probably owned by the celestial specialist Anu-aba-utēr—ACT 174.⁹⁸ Here we may invoke the same explanation as in Section iii) regarding the unprotected ACT 163, namely that this is also a pedagogical tablet. The scribe of ACT 174, Anu-uballit from the Ekur-zākir family, was apprenticed to Anu-aba-utēr to learn astronomy, and he appears here (and on the few other surviving tablets he wrote) without the title *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Ellil*. It is likely that this is one of his training tablets, and it may not be a coincidence that it is the same type of text that Anu-aba-utēr was practising in ACT 163.

It remains to deal with the one protected and eight unprotected tablets belonging to the *kalūs* which have not yet been discussed. The majority of the unprotected tablets neatly support the trend that each group protected its own professional corpus and not an abstracted body of exclusive knowledge. They include a lamentation to Ellil—of less relevance in Seleucid Uruk than the lamentation to Anu which was protected—a mathematical text, and five compositions which *were* protected by the *āšipus*: *Šumma Alu*, *Maqlū* and three copies of temple-building rituals.⁹⁹ The omens

⁹⁷ ACT 102, 135; TCL 6, 12.

⁹⁸ ACT 192 is another unprotected lunar tablet, but the individual whose name is partly preserved is not a scribe of *Enūma Anu Ellil*, so on the present evidence this conforms to the expected pattern.

⁹⁹ Respectively: BRM 4, 11; TCL 6, 33; BRM 4, 21; *BaM. Beih.* 2, 16; 12; TCL 6, 45; 46. The remaining unprotected

tablet, *BaM. Beih.* 2, 06, contains a prayer for the prize bull, with an obvious connection to the *kalūs'* ritual activity. This too may be a pedagogical tablet; it was written by Anu-balassu-iqbi for Anu-aba-utēr (although probably later than ACT 194 which *is* protected), and the scribe does not have a professional title.

and incantations are unrelated to the *kalûs*' professional activity, but although the building rituals did involve the *āšipus*, they are explicitly assigned to the domain of *kalûtu* in the text itself, and so we cannot explain them away here on the basis of irrelevance to the *kalûs*' professional activity. However, it is likely that these tablets are pedagogical. TCL 6, 46 is the earliest scholarly tablet attributable to Anu-bēlšunu, who identifies himself as "junior lamentation priest" in the colophon, while *BaM. Beih.* 2, 12, a partial duplicate of TCL 6, 46, is the earliest datable scholarly tablet written by his son, Anu-aba-utēr, some thirty years later. The third tablet is undated, but the lack of a professional title suggests that it is early within Anu-bēlšunu's scholarly career.¹⁰⁰

The final protected tablet provides a fitting conclusion to our study of the Uruk scholars, since it highlights the investment in their professional identity which we have identified as crucial to understanding the protective formulae they applied to their tablets. *BaM. Beih.* 2, 89 (Table H, Colophon 47), written by Anu-bēlšunu (2), is the list of *apkallū* and *ummānū* which traces an unbroken line of scholarship from the prehistoric sage Oannes to, it would seem, Seleucid times.¹⁰¹ Sîn-lēqi-unninni, whom the family claimed as their ancestor, has the honour of being listed as the first post-diluvian *ummānu*, for king Gilgameš. In this way the Seleucid *kalûs* re-asserted their authority and importance in an Uruk very different from the city in which they believed Gilgameš had taken counsel from their eponymous ancestor. It is probably no accident that *BaM. Beih.* 2, 89, written in 164 B.C., is one of our latest datable scholarly tablets from Uruk; although they are not themselves listed as *ummānū*, the appearance of the names Aḫīqar and Nikarchos at the end of the text rather neatly prefigures the process by which cuneiform scholarship would, in the not too distant future, finally give way to Aramaic and Greek.

IV. Conclusions

In the case of Achaemenid and Seleucid Uruk, asking "Why are these particular texts marked?" leads not, as Lenzi claims, to a dead end, but to a network of clearly articulated relationships between the professional specialism(s) of the individual scholar and the texts he sought to protect. *Āšipus* and *kalûs* marked as restricted the particular body of knowledge at the heart of their respective disciplines, leaving unprotected a range of other material which fell within their interest and understanding but was more peripheral to their professional roles. Within both groups, a few individuals who developed a secondary specialism in celestial science collaborated across familial and professional boundaries, protecting similar but not identical material within their new area of competence depending on its relation to their primary profession. This in fact brings us close to Lenzi's contention that texts connected with the five scholarly disciplines were classified as secret, but with the important difference that these classifications did not take place on a general, abstract level as envisaged by Lenzi and others, but rather according to the profession of individual scribes.

Overall, then, a close analysis of the Uruk corpora offers a persuasive challenge to the traditional classification and interpretation of "secret", or, as I would prefer to call it, "protected" scholarship in Mesopotamia. On the one hand, previous approaches may have been too narrow in their conceptualisation of methods of intellectual protection by Assyrian and Babylonian scholars, which include formulae beyond those explicitly referring to knowledge. Conversely, the existence of coherent small-scale patterns in distribution suggests that the interpretation of these colophons has previously been focused at too general and abstract a level; they are closely and deliberately tied to their immediate intellectual context, and should be analysed as such rather than viewed as part of a single, abstract body of "secret knowledge".

As more Akkadian and Sumerian texts continue to be published, it is increasingly clear that the intellectual history of Assyria and Babylonia is more complex than earlier editors of cuneiform texts could infer from the limited sources available to them. Oppenheim's (1975) "stream of tradition" model rightfully captures the high level of engagement with, and respect for, the writings of past

¹⁰⁰ TCL 6, 46. Only the first part of the king's name (Seleucus) is preserved. Pearce and Doty (2000: 332 n. 6) state that the king is "likely to be Seleukos IV" (r. 187–175 B.C.) but it could equally well be Seleucus II (r. 246–226) or III (r. 226/5–222); Anu-bēlšunu's earliest tablet is from 231 B.C.

¹⁰¹ Based on the fact that the Greek name Nikarchos, transliterated *nī-qa-qu-ru-su-ū*, appears in r.5. On this text see Beaulieu 2000: 3–4; Lenzi 2008: 106–09.

generations which is a defining characteristic of cuneiform scholarship in Mesopotamia. However, our greater ability to assess sources from multiple periods and intellectual contexts now allows us to appreciate the ways in which scholarship in local centres, and the choices and interests of various groups and individuals, constantly selected from and modified the “stream”, or streams, to which they had access. The model for intellectual protection proposed here fits well into this emerging understanding of flexibility and creativity; the writers of our cuneiform texts are revealed not as a monolithic group of “scribes” engaged in the transmission of a canonised body of knowledge, but as individual scholars who sought to guard their own professional praxis and identity using the most powerful medium they knew: writing. Much more could be said about this process, for other elements of colophons were also deliberately selected and constructed to express intellectual, familial and even personal identity. However, this step towards understanding scholars’ use of protective formulae in Late Babylonian Uruk may perhaps serve as a further confirmation that Mesopotamian intellectual activity cannot be understood as a relatively abstract, static whole, but rather at local, familial and individual levels. The history of cuneiform scholarship is, after all, a story of scholars as well as texts.

Bibliography

- Beaulieu, P.-A. (1992) “New light on secret knowledge in Late Babylonian culture”, *ZA* 82: 98–111.
- Beaulieu, P.-A. (2000) “The descendants of Šin-lēqi-unninni”, in Marzahn and Neumann 2000, pp. 1–16.
- Beaulieu, P.-A. (2006) “The astronomers of the Esagil temple in the fourth century BC”, in A. K. Guinan, M. de Jong Ellis, A. J. Ferrara, S. Freedman, M. Rutz, L. Sassmannshausen, S. Tinney and M. W. Waters (eds.), *If A Man Builds A Joyful House: Assyriological Studies in Honor of Erle Verduin Leichty*, pp. 5–22. Boston: Brill.
- Beaulieu, P.-A. (2010) “The afterlife of Assyrian scholarship in Hellenistic Babylonia”, in J. Stackert, B. Nevling Porter and D. P. Wright (eds.), *Gazing on the Deep: Ancient Near Eastern and Other Studies in Honor of Tzvi Abusch*, pp. 1–18. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Boiy, T. (2004) *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon* (OLA 136). Leuven: Peeters.
- Borger, R. (1964) “Geheimwissen”, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 3, pp. 188–91.
- Bottéro, J. (1985) *Mythes et rites de Babylone*. Paris: Champion.
- Clancier, P. (2009) *Les bibliothèques en Babylonie dans la deuxième moitié du 1^{er} millénaire av. J.-C* (AOAT 363). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Finkel, I. L. (2000) “On Late Babylonian medical training”, in A. R. George and I. L. Finkel (eds.), *Wisdom, Gods and Literature: Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W. G. Lambert*, pp. 137–223. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Frahm, E. (2010) “The latest Sumerian proverbs”, in S. C. Melville and A. L. Slotsky (eds.), *Opening the Tablet Box: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Benjamin R. Foster* (CHANE 42), pp. 155–84. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Frahm, E. (2011) *Babylonian and Assyrian Text Commentaries: Origins of Interpretation* (GMTR 5). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Geller, M. (2010) *Ancient Babylonian Medicine: Theory and Practice*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- George, A. (1991) “Babylonian texts from the folios of Sidney Smith, part two: prognostic and diagnostic omens”, *RA* 85: 137–67.
- Gesche, P. (2001) *Schulunterricht in Babylonien im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (AOAT 275). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Hunger, H. (1968) *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* (AOAT 2). Kevalaer: Butzon and Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins.
- Hunger, H. (1976) *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, I* (Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka. Endberichte 9). Berlin: Mann.
- Jean, C. (2006) *La magie néo-assyrienne en contexte: recherches sur le métier d'exorciste et le concept d'āšipūtu* (SAAS 17). Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Jursa, M. (1999) *Das Archiv des Bēl-rēmanni*. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
- Kilmer, A. D. (1963) “The first tablet of *maliku* = *šarru* together with its explicit version”, *JAOS* 83: 421–46.
- Lambert, W. G. (1957) “Ancestors, authors, and canonicity”, *JCS* 11: 1–14.
- Lenzi, A. (2008) *Secrecy and the Gods: Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel* (SAAS 19). Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Limet, H. (1986) “Le secret et les écrits: aspects de l'ésotérisme en Mésopotamie ancienne”, in H. Limet and J. Ries (eds.), *Les rites d'initiation: actes du colloque de Liège et de Louvain-la-Neuve, 20-21 Novembre 1984*, pp. 243–54. Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d'Histoire des Religions.
- McEwan, G. J. P. (1981) *Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

- Marzahn, J., and Neumann, H. (eds.) (2000) *Assyriologica et Semitica: Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Neugebauer, O. (1955) *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts* (3 vols). London: Lund Humphries.
- Oelsner, J. (1991) "Review of E. von Weiher, *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk III*", *OLZ* 86: 41–46.
- Offner, G. (1950) "À propos de la sauvegarde des tablettes en Assyro-Babylonie", *RA* 44: 135–43.
- Oppenheim, A. L. (1975) "The position of the intellectual in Mesopotamian society", *Daedalus* 104: 37–46.
- Ossendrijver, M. (2011) "Exzellente Netzwerke: die Astronomen von Uruk", in G. Selz and K. Wagensonner (eds.), *The Empirical Dimension of Near Eastern Studies*, pp. 631–44. Vienna: LIT-Verlag.
- Pearce, L., and Doty, L. (2000) "The activities of Anu-bêlšunu, Seleucid scribe", in Marzahn and Neumann 2000, pp. 331–42.
- Robson, E. (2008) *Mathematics in Ancient Iraq: A Social History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Robson, E. (2011) "The production and dissemination of scholarly knowledge", in K. Radner and E. Robson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, pp. 557–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robson, E. (2013) "Reading the libraries of Assyria and Babylonia", in J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (eds.), *Ancient Libraries*, pp. 38–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rochberg, F. (1993) "The cultural locus of astronomy in Late Babylonia", in H. D. Galter (ed.), *Die Rolle der Astronomie in den Kulturen Mesopotamiens. Beiträge zum 3. Grazer Morgenländischen Symposium (23.–27. September 1991)*, pp. 31–45. Graz: GrazKult.
- Rochberg, F. (2000) "Scribes and scholars: the *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil*", in Marzahn and Neumann 2000, pp. 359–76.
- Rochberg, F. (2004) *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheil, V. (1918) "Pour la police des bibliothèques", *RA* 15: 143–44.
- Too, Y. L. (2010) *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Driel, G. (2002) *Elusive Silver: In Search of a Role for a Market in an Agrarian Environment: Aspects of Mesopotamian Society* (PIHANS 95). Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Von Weiher, E. (1982–1998) *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk* (4 vols, Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka. Endberichte 10–13). Berlin: Mann; Mainz: P. von Zabern.
- Waerzeggers, C. (2010) *The Ezida Temple of Borsippa: Priesthood, Cult, Archives*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Kathryn Stevens
 Trinity College
 Cambridge
 CB2 1TQ
 UK
 krs45@cam.ac.uk

TABLE A: Scholarly tablets of the Šangû-Ninurta family.¹

| <i>SpTU No.</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>Protected?</i> (<i>X = broken, unknown</i>) |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| 1, 31 | Sa-gig 5 commentary | N |
| 1, 32 | Sa-gig 7 commentary | N |
| 1, 43 | List of diseases | N |
| 1, 49 | Commentary to prescriptions for illnesses caused by ghost | N |
| 1, 50 | Commentary to prescriptions for epilepsy | N |
| 1, 72 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> commentary | N |
| 1, 83 | <i>Alamdimmû</i> commentary | N |
| 3, 66 | <i>Bīt Rimki</i> 3 | N |
| 3, 99 | <i>Šumma Alu</i> commentary | N |
| 3, 100 | Medical(?) omen commentary | N |
| 4, 127 | <i>Bīt Rimki</i> 6 | N |
| 4, 128 | Bilingual incantations | N |
| 4, 172 | Metrological tables | N |
| 4, 174 | Table of many-place reciprocals | N |
| 5, 231 | <i>Ašipu's Handbook</i> | N |
| - <i>BaM.</i> 21, 483 | Mathematical problems | N |
| 1, 28 | Sa-gig 1 commentary | X |
| 1, 38 | Sa-gig 19 commentary | X |
| 1, 44 | Sa-gig 9 th <i>pirsu</i> | X |
| 1, 56 | List of ingredients for magical purposes | X |
| 1, 60 | Medical prescriptions | X |
| 4, 151 | <i>Alamdimmû</i> 5 | X |
| 1, 33 | Sa-gig 7 commentary | Y |
| 1, 45 | Prescriptions against nasal diseases | Y |
| 1, 47 | Sa-gig commentary | Y |
| 1, 48 | Sa-gig 45 | Y |
| 1, 51 | Commentary to medical prescriptions | Y |
| 1, 59 | Sa-gig 41 | Y |
| 1, 126 + 3, 107 | An = <i>Anu</i> 3 | Y |
| 2, 8 | <i>Bīt Mēseri</i> | Y |
| 3, 69 | <i>Bīt Mēseri</i> tabular overview | Y |
| 3, 84 | Incantations against Lamaštu | Y |
| 3, 90 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> 1 | Y |
| 3, 116 | ḪAR-gud (B) | Y |
| 4, 152 | Sa-gig 33 | Y |
| 5, 241 | Ritual for <i>Maqlû</i> -like incantation | Y |
| 5, 242 | <i>Šurpu</i> 3–4 | Y |
| 5, 248 | Ritual for good childbirth | Y |
| 5, 254 | Medical omen commentary | Y |

¹ Here and in the Ekur-zākir corpus from Ue XVIII I include only those tablets where the colophon permits attribution to one family or the other. For an overview of all the

tablets from Ue XVIII and an attempt to reconstruct the different family collections see Clancier 2009: 47–73.

TABLE B: Scholarly tablets of the fourth-century Ekur-zākir family.²

| <i>SpTU No.</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>Protected?</i> |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|
| 1, 69 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> 10 | N |
| 1, 80 | <i>Bārûtu</i> 29 | N |
| 1, 90 | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> 56 commentary | N |
| 1, 94 | Astrological price forecasts | N |
| 1, 96 | List of zodiacal constellations that affect each other | N |
| 2, 2 | <i>Muššu'û</i> 2 | N |
| 2, 5 | Bilingual incantations to Ea | N |
| 2, 21 | Incantation rituals against bad dreams | N |
| 2, 25 | <i>Ušburruda</i> incantation and ritual | N |
| 2, 32 | <i>Šumma Alu</i> excerpts 20–21 (tablet 64) | N |
| 2, 33 | <i>Šumma Alu</i> excerpt 38 | N |
| 2, 34 | <i>Šumma Alu</i> excerpt 43 | N |
| 2, 35 | Omens of <i>akītu</i> festival | N |
| 2, 39 | Commentary to ša-zi-ga incantations | N |
| 2, 43 | Horoscopic table | N |
| 2, 44 | Sa-gig 16 | N |
| 2, 51 | Ur ₅ -ra= <i>hubullu</i> 9 | N |
| 3, 65 | <i>Muššu'û</i> 2 | N |
| 3, 91 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> 5 | N |
| 3, 105 | Calendar text for Arahšamnu | N |
| 4, 150 | <i>Alamdimmû</i> 6 | N |
| 4, 162 | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> 20 commentary | N |
| 5, 245 | Fragment of incantation ritual | N |
| 5, 265 | Astrological birth omens | N |
| - TCL 6, 9 | Omens of <i>akītu</i> festival | N |
| - TCL 6, 17 | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> 8 commentary | N |
| - BRM 4, 20 | <i>Ašipu's Almanac</i> commentary | N |
| 2, 18 | <i>Namburbu</i> ritual | X |
| 4, 133 | Unidentified incantation or ritual | X |
| 4, 159 | Astrological <i>Bārûtu</i> | X |
| 4, 188 | <i>Erimḫuš</i> 5 | X |
| 5, 240 | Incantation rituals | X |
| 1, 14 | <i>Muššu'û</i> 7 | Y |
| 2, 6 | Bilingual incantations against Ardat-lilī | Y |
| 2, 9 | <i>Pazuzu</i> | Y |
| 2, 37 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> 8–12 commentary | Y |
| 2, 38 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> 17 commentary | Y |
| 3, 97 | <i>Šumma Alu</i> excerpts 70–71 | Y |
| 3, 104 | Calendar text for Du'ūzu | Y |
| 4, 140 | <i>Maqlû</i> -like incantations | Y |
| 4, 141 | Temple-building rituals | Y |
| 4, 147 | Colophon fragment | Y |
| 4, 158 | <i>Bārûtu</i> —dub ḫa-la | Y |
| 4, 220 | Building materials and parts for shrines of various deities | Y |
| - TCL 6, 34 | <i>Qutāru</i> varia | Y |
| - TCL 6, 50 | <i>Namburbu</i> ritual | Y |
| - RA 12, 75 | Sumerian hymn to Inana; Akkadian translation and glosses | Y |

² For reasons of chronology, SpTU 1, 2 and SpTU 4, 157 from Ue XVIII, written in 251 and 228 B.C. respectively, are grouped with the third- and second-century Ekur-zākir tablets in the following section. Similarly, six illicitly excavated tablets of Iqīšaya and Ištār-šuma-ēreš are counted

here together with the Ue XVIII corpus, as they predate the other illicitly excavated Ekur-zākir tablets by at least 50 years. These are: TCL 6, 9; 17; 34; 50; BRM 4, 20 and RA 12, 75.

TABLE C: Scholarly tablets owned or written by members of the third- and second-century Ekur-zākir family.³

| <i>Tablet</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>Protected?</i> |
|----------------|--|-------------------|
| TCL 6, 2 | <i>Bārātu</i> 43 (<i>Šumma Martu</i> 4) | N |
| TCL 6, 3 | <i>Bārātu</i> 30 (<i>Šumma Pān Tākalti</i> 6) | N |
| TCL 6, 4 | <i>Bārātu</i> | N |
| TCL 6, 5 | <i>Bārātu</i> (<i>Rikis Girri</i> 20) | N |
| TCL 6, 7 | <i>Bārātu</i> | N |
| TCL 6, 16 | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> 56 | N |
| TCL 6, 19 | Astrological weather forecasts | N |
| TCL 6, 35 | <i>Erimḫuš</i> 5 | N |
| TCL 6, 38 | Daily offerings in Uruk | N |
| TCL 6, 39 | New year (<i>Tašrītu</i>) rituals (Hunzû owner, EZ scribe) | N |
| ACT 101 (J) | Lunar ephemeris: new moons | N |
| ACT 161 (V) | Lunar auxiliary table: function for full moons | N |
| ACT 163 (H) * | Lunar auxiliary table: functions for full moons (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | N |
| ACT 501 (Y) * | Planetary ephemeris: Mars (SLU owner, EZ scribe) | N |
| ACT 702 (Z) * | Planetary ephemeris: Saturn (SLU owner, EZ scribe) | N |
| BRM 4, 12 | <i>Bārātu</i> | N |
| BRM 4, 13 | <i>Bārātu</i> | N |
| UVB 15, 37 | Hymn or prayer to Šin | N |
| SpTU 1, 2 | Chronicle of the reign of Šulgi | N |
| SpTU 4, 157 | <i>Bārātu</i> —dub ḫa-la | N |
| ACT 300 (P) * | Planetary ephemeris: Mercury, morning star (SLU owner, EZ scribe) | X |
| ACT 601 (M) * | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter, second stationary point (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | X |
| ACT 651 (O) | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter, daily motion | X |
| ACT 803 (N) | Procedure text for Mars | X |
| UCP 9, 398–399 | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> 33 | X |
| TCL 6, 1 | <i>Bārātu</i> 97 (<i>Šumma Multābiltu</i> 14) | Y |
| TCL 6, 10 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> varia | Y |
| TCL 6, 15+ | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> catalogue | Y |
| BRM 4, 7 | New year rituals | Y |
| BRM 4, 8 | Bilingual hymn to Anu (Lugal-dimmer-ankia) | Y |
| ACT 171 (F) * | Lunar auxiliary table: functions for full moons (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | Y |
| ACT 600 (L) * | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter, first stationary point (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | Y |
| K. 3753 | Calendar text for second half of the year | Y |

³ Several tablets occur both here and in Table D since they involve cross-family pairings; these are starred. In each table, tablets which have been included based on the scribe

rather than the owner are indicated. The letters in brackets after the ACT numbers indicate the colophon letter in ACT I.

TABLE D: Scholarly tablets owned or written by the Seleucid Sîn-lēqi-unninni family.⁴

| Tablet | Description | Protected? |
|--------------------------|--|------------|
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 6 | <i>Šu-illaku</i> prayer of the prize bull (for kettledrum rituals) | N |
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 12 | Temple-building rituals | N |
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 16 | <i>Maqlû</i> 8 | N |
| BRM 4, 11 | Lamentation | N |
| BRM 4, 21 | <i>Šumma Alu</i> 38 | N |
| ACT 102 (T) | Lunar ephemeris | N |
| ACT 163 (H) * | Lunar auxiliary table: functions for full moons (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | N |
| ACT 174 (W) | Lunar auxiliary table: functions for full moons | N |
| ACT 192 (K) | Lunar auxiliary table: daily positions of the moon | N |
| ACT 400 (D) | Planetary ephemeris: Venus, first visibility as evening star | N |
| ACT 501 (Y) * | Planetary ephemeris: Mars (SLU owner, EZ scribe) | N |
| ACT 640 (Q) | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter, first visibility and second stationary point | N |
| ACT 702 (Z) * | Planetary ephemeris: Saturn (SLU owner, EZ scribe) | N |
| ACT 802 (Zd) | Procedure text: Saturn | N |
| TCL 6, 33 | Mathematical word problems | N |
| TCL 6, 45 | Temple-building rituals | N |
| TCL 6, 46 | Temple-building rituals | N |
| VAT 7815 | Calendar text for Kislimu | N |
| A 3405 (Steele 2000) | Table of planetary phases | N |
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 65 | <i>Bārûtu</i> | X |
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 86 | Planetary auxiliary table: Mars | X |
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 109 | Unidentified fragment | X |
| ACT 165 (Ze) | Lunar auxiliary table: functions for full moons | X |
| ACT 300 (P) * | Planetary ephemeris: Mercury, morning star (SLU owner, EZ scribe) | X |
| ACT 601 (M) * | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter, second stationary point (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | X |
| ACT 800a (R) | Planetary auxiliary table: Mercury as morning star | X |
| ACT 1032 (Zf) | Ephemeris | X |
| TCL 6, 54 | Edina-usagake | X |
| TCL 6, 57 | Nirgal-lu-e-de | X |
| VAT 7816 | Calendar text for Nisannu | X |
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 5 | Kettledrum rituals | Y |
| <i>BaM. Beih.</i> 2, 89 | List of <i>apkallû</i> and <i>ummânû</i> | Y |
| ACT 135 (U) | Lunar ephemeris: eclipses | Y |
| ACT 171 (F) * | Lunar auxiliary table: functions for full moons (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | Y |
| ACT 194 (Zc) | Lunar auxiliary table: daily positions of the moon | Y |
| ACT 600 (L) * | Planetary ephemeris: Jupiter, first stationary point (EZ owner, SLU scribe) | Y |
| TCL 6, 12+ | Microzodiac | Y |
| TCL 6, 32 | Mathematical—Esagil tablet (Aḫi'ūtu owner, SLU scribe) | Y |
| TCL 6, 44 | Kettledrum rituals | Y |
| TCL 6, 48 | Lamentation | Y |

⁴ I have only included tablets where attribution to the Sîn-lēqi-unninnis is certain. Thus, for instance, when we find the name Anu-bēlšunu without a family affiliation this is not

sufficient, since there was an individual with the same name from the Ekur-zākir family.

TABLE E: Colophons of Šangû-Ninurta protected tablets.⁵

| No. | SpTU | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|--------|-------------|---|-------------|-----------|
| 1. | 4, 152 | Sa-gig 33 | r.56 [] x ti ša-šú nu il-šú munus bi ša-[šú] 57 [gim sumun]-šú sar-ma ba-rù šup-pi m ^{ri} -mut-[Anu m ^{ari} ša] 58 [Šamaš-iddin] dumu [] kid-bar- < ⁴ nin-urta > ^{lu} maš-maš ^{lu} qaq-qar- ^{dl} [a-nu ^{ki} -ú] 59 [] la i- ⁱ tab-bal' [...]. has no desire, that woman [...] desire [...]. Written and checked [according to] its [original]. Tablet of Rīmūt-[Anu, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of] Šangû- <Ninurta>, incantation priest, Urukēan. Whoever reveres DN[...] shall not take (it) away. r.7 dub 45-kām-ma DIŠ na ugu-šú kum ú-kal bul-[lu bī] ^{md} dā-bi _i -bi. ⁶ 8 [g]im sumun-šú sar-[m]a [ba]-ri im ^{md} šā-maš-SUM-N[A] ^{lu} maš-maš bān-da dumu-a-ni ša ^m [Nadinu] 9 dumu ^{lu} kid-bar- ⁴ nin-urta ^{lu} KI-60-KI-u mud ⁴ 60 u ⁴ 15 [lā itabbal] Tablet 45 of "If a man's head suffers from fever"; "Cure from the house of Dābibu". Written and checked [according to its original]. Tablet of Šamaš-iddin, junior incantation priest, son of [Nadin], descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, Urukēan. Whoever reveres Anu and Ištar [shall not take it away]. r.14' DIŠ munus úš-šá ku ₅ -ma úš-šá nu [] 15' [du]b 41'-kām DIŠ na ugu-[šú] kum ú-kal bul- ^{tu} é [Dābibu?] 16' gaba-ri unu[^g] [kīma labīri-šú] ^{md} 60-ik-šar a-šú ša ^m [Šamaš-iddin] 17' in-sar-ma ib-rú im ^{md} utu-mu x [] 18' pa-liš ⁴ a- ⁿ u u] ⁴ 15 nu i ₁₁ -[tabbal] "If a woman's blood is blocked and her blood is not [...]." Tablet 41' of "If a man's head suffers from fever". "Cure from the house of [Dābibu]". Urukēan copy. [According to its] [original] Anu-ikšur, son of [Šamaš-iddin ...] wrote and checked it. Tablet of Šamaš-iddin [...]. Whoever reveres An[^u and] Ištar shall not ta[ke it away]. | Rīmūt-Anu | ----- |
| 2. | 1, 48 | Sa-gig 45 | | Šamaš-iddin | ----- |
| 3. | 1, 59 | Sa-gig 41 | | Šamaš-iddin | Anu-ikšur |

Continued

⁵ Transliterations follow published editions with some alterations by the author, based on photographs where available; translations by the author, taking account of updated terminology relating to commentaries from Frahm 2011. Departures from published readings are indicated in the notes only where this alters the understanding of the colophon.

⁶ For this reading, see Frahm 2011: 233, n. 1090.

TABLE E: (Continued)

| No. | SPTU | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|--------------------|----------------------|--|-----------|--------|
| 4. | 1, 33 | Sa-gig 7 commen-tary | r.7 DIŠ gig geštu 15-šu tar-kát gig-su dugud ^u 8 <i>ša-a-tú ú šu-ut ka ša ka um-me-[a]</i> 9 <i>ša DIŠ gig eme-šu sast mál-su-ut ^{ma}a-nu-ik-šulr</i> 10 <i>dumu ša ^{ma}utu-SUM-NA ša-bal-bal ^{ma}kid-bar-^anin-urta</i> 11 ^{ma} šaš-maš bān-da ^{ma} qaq-qar- ^a a-nu ^{bi} -u 12 <i>pa-liḫ ^aa-nu u an-tu₄ nu i₁₁-ta-db-bā-alla</i> “If a patient’s right ear is dark, his illness will worsen”. Lemmata and oral explanations from the mouth of a (master)-scholar of “If a patient’s tongue is red”. Reading of Anu-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, junior incantation priest, Urukian. Whoever reveres Anu and Anu shall not take (it) away. r.3’ <i>šast [ast-túst u šut pi ša DIŠ anīlu eme’]-šūst</i> 4’ <i>ebst -[ēst-elst-māst malsūt Anu-ik]-šu-ur</i> 5’ <i>maš-maš ‘a’ [Šamaš-iddin mār Šangû]-^a[n]n-urta</i> 6’ <i>pa-liḫ ^aME-ME li₆-ša₆(DI)-qir₆(KA)</i> Lemmata and oral explanations of “If a man’s tongue is cramped”. Reading of Anu-ikšur, incantation priest, s[on] of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta. Whoever reveres Gula, may he treasure (it). ⁸ r.17 <i>nig-zi-gal-eḫ-na u šu-ut ka ša DIŠ na sag-du-su []</i> 18 <i>ša ka um-me-a bul-tu é ^{ma}dā-bi₆-bi₆ 2 [pirsust]</i> 19 <i>mál-su-ut ^{ma}kur-gal-ik-šur dumu ša ^{ma}ut[u-iddin]</i> 20 ^{ma} šaš-maš dumu ^{ma} sanga- ^a nin-urta <i>pa-liḫ []</i> 21 <i>li-ša-qīr</i>] DIŠ na sag-du-su ‘gu ₇ ’-[šū] Lemmata and oral explanations of “If a man’s head [...]”, from the mouth of a (master)-scholar. “Cure from the house of Dābibu”, 2 nd [section st ...]. Reading of Anu-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, incantation priest, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta. Whoever reveres [DN ...], may he treasure (it). “If a man’s head hurts [him].” | Anu-ikšur | ----- |
| 5. | 1, 47 ⁷ | Sa-gig 7 commen-tary | | Anu-ikšur | ----- |
| 6. | 1, 51 | Medical commen-tary | | Anu-ikšur | ----- |

Continued

⁸ Although it does not contain a prohibition or curse, the structural similarities and the context of protection justify the inclusion of this and No. 29 within the corpus of protective colophons. Gula is only invoked on these two tablets, which both contain medical texts; this can hardly be accidental and demonstrates that the choice of gods could be linked to content.

⁷ The transliteration of r. 3’-4’ follows Frahm 2011: 398–400. In r. 5’ Frahm reads *maš-maš [šeḫri(?) mār Šangû]*, but the copied traces support A rather than BĀN after the second MĀŠ. Anu-ikšur rarely appears without his filiation in this corpus, particularly when his family name is given.

TABLE E: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|--------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|--------------|
| 7. | 5, 254 | Medical commentary (?) ⁹ | r.10 gaba-ri ⁸³ [e-u ₅ -um [] A [] 11 [] im ⁸⁴ ša-māš-SUM-NA dumu ša ⁸⁵ n[ā-di-nu] 12 [ša-ba]l-bal ⁸⁶ kid-bar- ⁸⁷ nin-urta ⁸⁸ qaq-qar- ⁸⁹ a-nu ⁹⁰ -ū 13 mud ⁹¹ DINGIR ⁹² a-nu u ⁹³ an ⁹⁴ -tu ⁹⁵ x x x x Traces of 3 further lines, not legible. Copy of a writing-board [. . .] Tablet of Šamaš-iddin, son of N[ādin], descendant of Šangū-Ninurta, Urukean. ¹⁰ Whoever reveres ⁹⁶ . . . Anu and Antu ⁹⁷ [shall not take it away]. ¹¹ r.10' [puppi ⁹⁸ 6]0-ik- ⁹⁹ gur dumu-a-ni ša ¹⁰⁰ 20-SUM-NA ¹⁰¹ māš-māš ¹⁰² 11' [mār ¹⁰³ kid]-bar- ¹⁰⁴ nin-urta ¹⁰⁵ qaq-qar- ¹⁰⁶ a-nu ¹⁰⁷ -ū 12' mud ¹⁰⁸ ū ¹⁰⁹ 15 nu tūm [Tablet of] Anu-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, incantation priest, [descendant of Šan]gū-Ninurta, Urukean. Whoever reveres Anu and Ištar ¹² shall not take (it) away. r.42 [g]im libir-ra-ša ša-fl ¹³ 5-ir-ma bari ¹⁴ puppi ¹⁵ Anu]-KA-kéš bu ¹⁶ 12-kūr ¹⁷ ša-māš-SUM-NA 43 [Š]A-AB-BA ¹⁸ -BA-ALLA ¹⁹ sanga- ²⁰ [Ninurta pāliḫ an-šār] u ²¹ ki-šār nu i ²² 11-tā-ab-bā-alla 44 [m]e-re-eš-ti nu ū-ša-am-6 Written and [checked] against its original. [Tablet of Anu]-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of Šangū-[Ninurta. Whoever reveres Anšar] and Kišar shall not take (it) away, [. . .] shall not deliberate let it be forgotten. ¹³ r.19 [én āš-h]ul gal ¹⁴ -la-gin ¹⁵ , lū-ra b[a-ni-in-gar] 20 [dub x-kam-m]ja šur-pu nu al-til gaba-ri x[] 21 [s]lar-ma igi-KAR ag-a im [Anu-ikšur māri ša] 22 [mudutu]-mu ša-bal-bal ¹⁶ sanga- ¹⁷ [nin-urta] 23 [qāt Anu-ušallim?] bu-kūr ¹⁸ 60-ik-šul[r] 24 [pāliḫ Anu] u an-tu, nu i-[tabba] [Incantation: "An evil curse like the gallu-demon has overcome this man" . . . Tablet x of] Šurpu, not complete. Copy [of . . .] written, checked, and made good. Tablet of [Anu]-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of Šangū-[Ninurta. Hand of Anu-ušallim ¹⁹], son of Anu-ikšur. . . Whoever reveres Anu] and Antu shall not take (it) away]. | Šamaš-iddin | ----- |
| 8. | 1, 45 | Medical recipes | | Anu-ikšur/ Šamaš-iddin | Anu-ikšur? |
| 9. | 5, 248 | Ritual for good childbirth | | Anu-ikšur | ----- |
| 10. | 5, 242 | Šurpu 3-4 | | Anu-ikšur | Anu-ušallim? |

Continued

⁹ See Frahm 2011: 236 on the identification of this text.
¹⁰ For *qaqqar-Anu* cf. *qaq-qa-ra-an* = *u-ru-uk*, *Malku* I 218 (Kilmer 1963: 428).
¹¹ This line is difficult to resolve. Although not read by von Weither, the traces of the first sign are consistent with MUD for *pāliḫ*, followed by DINGIR, but then the line resumes slightly lower down with *a-nu*. After that, *u* is clear but from the copy the next signs do not look like the expected *an-tu*, or *a*15 (perhaps *é-a*?). Nonetheless there does appear to be a protective formula here.
¹² The invocation of Ištar in the prohibition is atypical for Anu-ikšur colophons, where Antu usually appears with Anu. However, the tablet is fragmentary and it is uncertain how many signs have been lost to the left. Rather than restoring one or two signs on each line, it might therefore be possible to restore Šamaš-iddin as owner and Anu-ikšur as scribe.
¹³ *ušamsū* was taken by Hunger as a Š-stem of *masū*, "to forget", thus giving a meaning "cause to be forgotten, allow to fall into oblivion." However, the CAD derives it from the Š-only verb *šamsū*, "to spend the night", constructing a meaning "keep overnight." I follow Hunger for two reasons. First, CAD "keep overnight" is solely based on these passages and contradicts the intransitive primary meaning of the verb. Secondly, there are no other time restrictions in the surviving Šangū-Ninurta colophons.
¹⁴ The missing name must be that of the scribe, and no other son of Anu-ikšur is known from the scholarly tablets.

TABLE E: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|--------|---|--|-------------|-----------|
| 11. | 5, 241 | Ritual for <i>Maqlû</i> -like incantation | r.7' <i>én an-nu-ú bi-ib-lu an-nu-ú bi-ib-bu-lu</i> 8' gaba-ri im <i>ša ta ugu im sumun 'mes'-lam šá-tir-ma igi-KÁR ag-a</i> 9' [i]m ^{md} <i>a-nu-ik-še-ur gi-nu-ú</i> ^{md} <i>ša-máš-SUM-NA ŠA-BÁ-BÁ-ALLA</i> 10' [i]kid-bar] ^d <i>lugal-URU-BAR-RA</i> ^{lu} <i>maš-maš</i> ^{md} <i>mud an-šár ú</i> ^d <i>ki-šár nu tùm</i> Incantation: "This, the removal, this, the disappearance". Copy of a tablet from an original tablet of Meslam; written, checked, and made good. Tablet of Anu-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of [Šangû]-Ninurta, ¹⁵ incantation priest. Whoever reveres Anšar and Kišar shall not take (it) away. r.45 <i>én be-lu ga-aš-rù šur-bu-ú e-tef-lu a-li-id an^c be-el šap-la-a-ti</i> 46 gaba-ri ^{es} <i>da sar-ma ba-ri tūp-pi</i> ^{md} <i>utu-SUM-NA</i> ^{lu} <i>maš-máš</i> 47 <i>dumu šá</i> ^{md} <i>na-di-nu dumu</i> ^{lu} <i>šanga-^dnin-urta</i> ^{lu} <i>qaq-qar-^da-nu^{k1}-ú</i> 48 <i>mud</i> ^{460 u} ^{415 nu tùm} Incantation: "Mighty lord, formidable prince, the one who begets the heavens, lord of the lower world". Copy of a writing-board, written and checked. Tablet of Šamaš-iddin, incantation priest, son of Nādin, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, Urukéan. Whoever reveres Anu and Ištar shall not take (it) away. r.28 <i>tukum-bi al-til : an-nu-ú né-pe-šu nu^{mes} giš-^{hur}mes én^{mes} šá</i> [<i>é mje-se-et be-pi es-šu</i> 29 <i>gim libir-ra-šu</i> ^{md} <i>HA-HAR-NIM-ik</i> (E)- <i>še-ur</i> ^{lu} <i>maš-máš dumu-[a]-ni</i> 30 <i>ša</i> ^{md} <i>ša-máš-SUM-NA dumu</i> ^{lu} <i>šanga-^dnin-urta</i> IN-SAR- <i>ma ib-[r]-i-im</i> 31 <i>pá-li-iš AN-ŠAR-GAL ú</i> ^d <i>KI-ŠAR-GAL</i> <i>nu i₁]ta-áb-bà-alla</i> 32 <i>ras. lu-ú ina me-re-es-ti nu il¹-šam¹-6</i> <i>tukum-bi</i> . Complete. These are the rituals, figurines, drawings, and incantations of "House of Confinement" (gloss: new break). According to its original, Anu-ikšur, incantation priest, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, wrote and checked it. Whoever reveres Anšar and Kišar shall not take (it) away, or deliberately let it be forgotten. ¹⁶ | Anu-ikšur | ----- |
| 12. | 3, 84 | <i>Lamaštu</i> | | Šamaš-iddin | ----- |
| 13. | 2, 8 | <i>Bīt Mēšeri</i> | | ----- | Anu-ikšur |

Continued

¹⁵ For ^d*lugal-URU-BAR-RA*=Ninurta, cf. Lambert 1957: 154.

¹⁶ Von Weher transliterates N[U *ú-saḫ-ḫar*] on the basis of a collation by von Soden, but this is unparalleled in the other colophons and does not match the traces on the copy. The last visible sign on the copy is clearly 6, to be compared with SpTU 5, 248, also by Anu-ikšur,

where the verb in question is the Š-stem of *mašû* and 6 is read syllabically as *keššu* for *ššu*. The penultimate sign might then possibly be read as *šam*; restoring only one sign in the break also makes sense in terms of the spacing of the preserved text.

TABLE E: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|--------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|
| 14. | 3, 69 | Tabular overview of <i>Bti Mēseri</i> | §36.5 al-til 6 [] <i>ki-ma libir-ra-ša^{md} a-nu-ik-ša-ir dumu-a-ni^{md} utu-SUM-NA dumu^{lu} kid-bar-^dnin-urta^{lu} maš-maš^{lu} a-ga-aš-gu-ú IN-SAR-[ma bar]</i> 7 [<i>tuppi Šamaš-iddin^{lu} maš-maš^{lu} bān</i>] <i>da dumu šā^{md} na-di-nu dumu^{lu} kid-bar-^dnin-urta^{lu} qa-qar-^da-nu^{ku}-ú pa-liḫ^a a-nu^u ū^a [5⁷ lā itabba] i-na mē-r[e-eš-ti]</i> Complete. [...] According to its original, Anu-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, junior incantation priest, wrote [and checked it. Tablet of Šamaš-iddin, jun]ior [incantation priest], son of Nādin, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, Urukian. Whoever reverses Anu and Ištar ¹⁷ shall not take it away, shall not] del[iberately. . .]. r.53' be munus ù-tu-ma sag-du ur-maḫ gar lugal <i>dan-nu ina kur gá^{lu}</i> 54' šu-nigin 1 UŠ 59-ām mu šid-bi dub 1-kam-ma be <i>iz-bu eš-gar be munus peš₄-ma šā šā-šā ér</i> 55' nu al-til gaba-ri unu ^{gi} gim sumun-šú sar-ma <i>ba-ri dub^{md} a-nu-ik-šur</i> 56' [du]mu <i>šā^{md} utu-mu dumu^{lu} sanga-^dmaš^{lu} maš-maš^{lu} bān-da qa-át^{md} a-nu-gi dumu-šú</i> 57' muld a]n-šār u ^a ki-šār nu tum "If a woman gives birth and (the baby) has a lion's head, there will be a mighty king in the land." Total, 1 sixty 59 lines, counted. Tablet 1 of "If an anomaly" (from) the series "If a woman is pregnant and her foetus cries". Not complete. Urukian copy, written and checked according to its original. Tablet of Anu-ikšur, son of Šamaš-iddin, descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, junior incantation priest. Hand of Anu-ušallim, his son. Whoever reve[re]s A]nšar and Kišar shall not take (it) away. r.ii.57' [HAR-gud <i>im-ri-im</i> 58' [] dumu ^{lu} sanga- ^d maš ^{lu} maš-maš ^{lu} 59' [] dumu ^{lu} HJ+DŠ-MEŠ 60' [] x en-en nu tum [Tablet n of the series HAR-gud]= <i>imrú</i> . [.] descendant of Šangû-Ninurta, incantation priest [.] son of x [. . .] . . . shall not take (it) away. ¹⁸ | Šamaš-iddin | Anu-ikšur |
| 15. | 3, 90 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> 1 | | Anu-ikšur | Anu-ušallim |
| 16. | 3, 116 | HAR-gud | | ----- | ----- |

Continued

¹⁷ While von Weither transliterates ^a[š-tar], the sign on the copy does not look like *iš* (cf. the writing of *iš-pa-tum* in § 31). From the traces the sign more closely resembles 15, which is also the usual writing for Ištar in colophons of tablets owned by Šamaš-iddin.

¹⁸ The colophon is very damaged, but nu tum makes a protective formula certain. The

reading of ^{md}ME-ME as ^{lu}maš^{lu}-maš^{lu} and correction of GENNA to dumu^m in l. 59 are noted by Oelsner 1991: 43. GKAB (http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/cams/gkab/sptu_3_116) reads mud(en) en, *pāliḫ Bēl*, in l. 60, but Bēl is more typical of colophons from Babylon than Uruk.

TABLE E: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|-----------------|-------------|---|-------------|-----------|
| 17. | 1, 126 + 3, 107 | An = Anu | r.ii.52 ^a inana ^a iš-tar 53 šu-nigin 2 ME 53 'mu' -[bi]-'im' dub-3-'kam an' : ^a a-nu-um 54 nu al-ti ki-ma la-bi-ri-[šú šu] 'm' ^a a-nu-ik-šur 55 ^{lu} maš-maš bān-da dumu ^{lu} kid-[bar]-'d' ^a nin-urta 56 im ^{md} ALAM-mu ^{lu} maš-maš bān-da [mār Sangā]-'nin-urta 57 mud ^a du-ri u ^a da-[ri lā i-t]ab-bal "Inana = Ištar". Total: 253 lines. Tablet 3 of "An = Anu". Incomplete. According to [its] original. [Hand of] Anu-ikšur, junior incantation priest, descendant of Sangū-Ninurta. Tablet of Šamaš-iddin, junior incantation priest, [descendant of Šangū]-Ninurta. Whoever reveres Duri and Da[ri] [shall not take (it) away]. ¹⁹ | Šamaš-iddin | Anu-ikšur |

TABLE F: Colophons of fourth-century Ekur-zākir protected tablets.

| No. | SpTU No. | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|----------|-----------------|---|--------|-----------------|
| 18. | 4, 140 | Ušburruda varia | r.13' ka-inim-ma up-puš, u igi-tab uš ₁₁ -b[ūr-ru-da-kam] 14' dū-dū-bi ^{na4} an-na ^{gš} GAN-U ₅ ^a eli-tu ₁₂ -lu ₄ ^a an-ḫūl-la ^a tar-[muš] 15' []RU NI ^{na4} an-na ^{na4} zālag ta an' ur-du-ni im ^{mba} bu ₁₂ -kū[r Ištar-šuma-ēreš lipippi Ekur-zākir] 16' [qāt] ^{md} inana-mu' -kam dumu-a-ni pa-liḫ ^a 60 ^a 50 [u ^a 40] Text made good and checked. Ušb[urruda]. Its ritual: <i>amāku</i> -stone, GAN-U ₅ -wood, <i>elituḫlu</i> -plant, <i>anḫullu</i> -plant, lupin ... <i>amāku</i> -stone, <i>zallāqu</i> -stone came down from heaven. Tablet of Iqšāya, son of [Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir. ... Hand of] Ištar-šuma-ēreš his son. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil [and Ea ...]. r.4' ēn šim-mat šim-mat šim-mat 'uzu' 5' im ^{mba} bu ₁₂ -kū[r ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{ne} kur-[za-kir] 6' pa-liḫ ^a a-nu ^a 50 ^a é-a nu tūm-šú ina me-r[eš-ti] 7' []bē' -gur' -šú šá [tūm-šú] Incantation: "Paralysis, paralysis, paralysis of the flesh." Tablet of Iqšāya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-[zākir]. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil, and Ea shall not take it away. [shall not deli]berately [...] should return it [...]. Whoever takes it away ...]. | Iqšāya | Ištar-šuma-ēreš |
| 19. | 1, 14 | Muššu ú 7 | | Iqšāya | ----- |

Continued

¹⁹ As noted by Oelsner, the final sign of r.ii.52 is *šur* rather than *bi*, and the penultimate sign of r.ii 55 is *tab* rather than *lit*.

TABLE F: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU No. | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|----------|----------------------------|---|-----------|-----------------|
| 20. | 2, 9 | Pazuzu | r.28' gim sumun-šú sar-ma ba-rù [] 29' ^m é-kur-za-kir ^{lu} maš-maš šu [] 30' [] x nu tùm-šú ina me-re[š-ti] 31' [] šá i-tùm-šú q [] 32' traces Written and checked according to its original. [...] Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. Hand of [...] Whoever reveres X... shall not take it away, [shall not] delibe[rately ...]. Whoever takes it away, [may] DN [...]. r.46 én an-ni-ti ul qa-ti up-puša u igi-tab 47 gim sumun-šú sar-ma ba-rù im ^{ba} ^{ša-a} bu ₁₂ -kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^m é-kur-za-kir ^{lu} maš-maš qāt 48 ^{md} inana-mu-kam dumu-a-ni pa-liḫ ^a a-nu-um ^d 50 ²⁰ u ^d dim nu tùm-šú ina me-reš-ti-šú la ú-šam-kiš-šú 49 ina u ₄ -šú ana é umun-šú hé-gur-šú šá i-tùm-šú ^d q[m] 'u ^d ša-la' lit-bal-šú This incantation is not complete. Made good and checked. Written and checked according to its original. Tablet of Iqīšāya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. Hand of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, his son. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea shall not take it away, shall not deliberately let it be lost. On the same day he should return it to its owner's house. Whoever takes it away, may Adad and Šala take him away. r.47 [ud-ul]-dù-a u šu-ut ka šá be iz-bu 48 [] x ina sag-ki-šú gar ^m 49 [] šú-lu ₄ šá-qu-ú 50 [tuppi Iqīšāya bu ₁₂]-' kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal'-bal ^m é-kur-za-kir 51 ^{lu} maš-maš qāt ^{md} inana-mu-kam 'dumu'-a-ni pa-liḫ ^d 60 ^d 50 u ^d 40 nu tùm-šú [Lem]ata and oral explanations of (the series) "If an anomaly". [...] is located on its forehead. [...] to raise (is a synonym of) to become high. [Tablet of Iqīšāya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. Hand of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, his son. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil, and Ea shall not take it away. | Iqīšāya | Ištar-šuma-ēreš |
| 22. | 2, 37 | Šumma Izbu 8-12 commentary | | [Iqīšāya] | Ištar-šuma-ēreš |

Continued

²⁰ The sign after DINGIR is certainly not *tu*₄ as read by von Weiher. When Anu and Ea are invoked, the second deity is usually Ellil, hence this reading is preferred.

TABLE F: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU No. | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|----------------|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| 23. | 2, 38 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> 17 commen- tary | r.7 ul šu-ut ka u maš-a-a-al-ti ša pi-i um-man-nu ša tib-bi 8 be iz-bu tūn-šu ina maš-kān mur-šu ša 15 gar ^{ai} 18 ^{ai} sa, bar 9 be iz-bu nu al-ti be u ₈ si-li-is-su gu, im-gid-da 10 ^{ma} ba ^{ša-a} bu ₁₂ -kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} é-kur-za-kir 11 ^{ma} š-maš tir-an-na ^{ki} -ū <<nu>> pa-liḫ ^a a-nu ^{en} en-lil 12 u ^d é-a <nu> lit-bal-šu ša i-tūm-šu ^{im} lit-bal-šu 13 ^{ma} šu u ₄ 14-kam mu-6-kam ^{pi} il-pi-is-su lugal kur-kur Lemmata, oral explanations and questioning by a (master)-scholar, from “If an anomaly—its stomach is located at the place of its right lung.” (Tablet) 18, completed (and) checked. “If an anomaly”, not complete. “If a ewe eats her afterbirth”. Long tablet of Iqīšaya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest, Tiranaean. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil, and Ea shall <not> take it away. Whoever takes it away, may Adad take him away. Month Du’ūzu, day 14, year 6, Philip, king of the lands. r.15 DIŠ ^a a-bu ² ū dumu ki-it-mu-lu 16 iš-tu ^{ga} da gaba-ri nuug ^{ki} sar-ma up-puša 17 im ^{ma} ba ^{ša-a} bu-kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} é-kur-za-kir 18 ^{ma} š-maš qāt ^{md} inana-mu-kam dumu-a-ni pa-liḫ ^a a-nim 19 ū an-tu ₄ nu tūm-šu ina u ₄ -mi-šu a-na é umun-šu 20 hé-gur-šu ^{nu} ne-ne-gar u ₄ -26-kam 21 mu-6-kam ^{pi} il-pi-is-su lugal kur-kur “If a father and son are angry with each other”. From a writing board, a copy from Uruk, written and made good. Tablet of Iqīšaya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. Hand of Ištar-šuma-ēreš his son. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. On the same day he should return it to its owner’s house. Month Abu, day 26, year 6, Philip, king of the lands. t.e. 1 [^{pu} ppi Iqīšaya bukur ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} é-kur-za-kir t.e. 2 [qāt ^{md} 60]-tin ² -iḫ x x x ^{pa} liḫ ^a a-nu tūm-šu [...]. Tablet of Iqīšaya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir [...]. hand of Anu] uballiḫ [...]. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. ²¹ t.e. 1 ^{pu} pi-lit-siḫ-ti šu ^u gala ^e an ka dub MUŠ ^u ana gaba-ri ^u [] t.e. 2 [x] ^{mu} du-ū gi-mir ka-la-mu : im ^{md} inana-mu-kam ¹ (ŠE) dumu-a-ni ba ^{ša-a} [] Tablet of what is required in the domain of the <i>kallā</i> -priest. According to the wording of a x tablet, according to a copy [from...]. one who knows all about everything. Tablet of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, son of Iqīšaya [...]. ²² | Iqīšaya | ----- |
| 24. | 3, 97 | <i>Šumma Alu</i> excerpts 70–71 | 14, year 6, Philip, king of the lands. r.15 DIŠ ^a a-bu ² ū dumu ki-it-mu-lu 16 iš-tu ^{ga} da gaba-ri nuug ^{ki} sar-ma up-puša 17 im ^{ma} ba ^{ša-a} bu-kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} é-kur-za-kir 18 ^{ma} š-maš qāt ^{md} inana-mu-kam dumu-a-ni pa-liḫ ^a a-nim 19 ū an-tu ₄ nu tūm-šu ina u ₄ -mi-šu a-na é umun-šu 20 hé-gur-šu ^{nu} ne-ne-gar u ₄ -26-kam 21 mu-6-kam ^{pi} il-pi-is-su lugal kur-kur “If a father and son are angry with each other”. From a writing board, a copy from Uruk, written and made good. Tablet of Iqīšaya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. Hand of Ištar-šuma-ēreš his son. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. On the same day he should return it to its owner’s house. Month Abu, day 26, year 6, Philip, king of the lands. t.e. 1 [^{pu} ppi Iqīšaya bukur ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} é-kur-za-kir t.e. 2 [qāt ^{md} 60]-tin ² -iḫ x x x ^{pa} liḫ ^a a-nu tūm-šu [...]. Tablet of Iqīšaya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir [...]. hand of Anu] uballiḫ [...]. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. ²¹ t.e. 1 ^{pu} pi-lit-siḫ-ti šu ^u gala ^e an ka dub MUŠ ^u ana gaba-ri ^u [] t.e. 2 [x] ^{mu} du-ū gi-mir ka-la-mu : im ^{md} inana-mu-kam ¹ (ŠE) dumu-a-ni ba ^{ša-a} [] Tablet of what is required in the domain of the <i>kallā</i> -priest. According to the wording of a x tablet, according to a copy [from...]. one who knows all about everything. Tablet of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, son of Iqīšaya [...]. ²² | Iqīšaya | Ištar-šuma-ēreš |
| 25. | - TCL 6, 50 | <i>Namburba</i> ritual | t.e. 1 [^{pu} ppi Iqīšaya bukur ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} é-kur-za-kir t.e. 2 [qāt ^{md} 60]-tin ² -iḫ x x x ^{pa} liḫ ^a a-nu tūm-šu [...]. Tablet of Iqīšaya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir [...]. hand of Anu] uballiḫ [...]. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. ²¹ t.e. 1 ^{pu} pi-lit-siḫ-ti šu ^u gala ^e an ka dub MUŠ ^u ana gaba-ri ^u [] t.e. 2 [x] ^{mu} du-ū gi-mir ka-la-mu : im ^{md} inana-mu-kam ¹ (ŠE) dumu-a-ni ba ^{ša-a} [] Tablet of what is required in the domain of the <i>kallā</i> -priest. According to the wording of a x tablet, according to a copy [from...]. one who knows all about everything. Tablet of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, son of Iqīšaya [...]. ²² | [Iqīšaya] | [Anu]-uballiḫ? |
| 26. | 4, 141 | Temple- building rituals | t.e. 1 [^{pu} ppi Iqīšaya bukur ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} é-kur-za-kir t.e. 2 [qāt ^{md} 60]-tin ² -iḫ x x x ^{pa} liḫ ^a a-nu tūm-šu [...]. Tablet of Iqīšaya, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir [...]. hand of Anu] uballiḫ [...]. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. ²¹ t.e. 1 ^{pu} pi-lit-siḫ-ti šu ^u gala ^e an ka dub MUŠ ^u ana gaba-ri ^u [] t.e. 2 [x] ^{mu} du-ū gi-mir ka-la-mu : im ^{md} inana-mu-kam ¹ (ŠE) dumu-a-ni ba ^{ša-a} [] Tablet of what is required in the domain of the <i>kallā</i> -priest. According to the wording of a x tablet, according to a copy [from...]. one who knows all about everything. Tablet of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, son of Iqīšaya [...]. ²² | Ištar-šuma-ēreš | ----- |

Continued

²¹ The sign after nu has usually been read IR³ but based on a recent photo by P. Clancier it seems to be a damaged tum, as would be expected.

²² I have included this colophon due to the presence of *mūdā*, but unfortunately it is too

damaged to be certain whether or not there was a reference to safeguarding or restricting knowledge.

TABLE F: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU No. | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|----------------|--|--|---|---|
| 27. | 4, 220 | Building materials for shrines | r.ii.19 [<i>lipippi Ekur-za</i>]-kir ^{1a} maš-maš qa-ti 20 [nu tūm-šú ina me-reš-ti-šú la u-šam-kiš-šú 21 [ša itabbalūšu Adad u ^q ša-la lit-bal-šú [Tablet of Iqīšāya, son of Ištār-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. Hand of Ištār-šuma-ēreš? ... Whoever reveres DN... shall not take it away, shall not deliberately let it be lost.] ... Whoever takes it away, may Adad and Šala take him away. ²³ r.32 im ^{ba} bu ^{12-a} kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} ē-kur-za-kir ^{1a} maš-maš 33 <qāt> ^{md} inana-mu-kam dumu-a-ni pa-liḫ ⁶⁰ en-lil u ^q a-la nu tūm-šú Tablet of Iqīšāya, son of Ištār-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. <Hand of> Ištār-šuma-ēreš his son. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea shall not take it away. r.ii.16' im-l-kam kù-gi iḡi-tab 17' [im] ^{ba} bu ^{12-a} kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} ē-kur-za-kir 18' qāt ^{md} inana-mu-kam dumu-a-ni pa-liḫ ⁶⁰ ME-ME li-šā-qir Tablet I, "gold". Checked. [Tablet of] Iqīšāya, son of Ištār-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir. Hand of Ištār-šuma-ēreš, his son. Whoever reveres Gula, may he treasure (it). r.24 im-gid-da ^{ba} bu ^{12-a} kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} ē-kur-za-kir ^{1a} maš-maš qāt ^{md} inana-mu-kam 25 dumu-a-ni pa-liḫ ⁶⁰ en-lil u ^q dim nu tūm-šú ina me-reš-ti-šú la u-šam-kiš-šú 26 ina te-šú ana é umun-šú hē-gur-šú ša i-tūm-šú ^q im u ^q a-la lit-bal-šú 27 ^{1a} bāra u ^q 23-kam mu-8-kam ^{md} pi-li-pi-is-su lugal kur-kur Long tablet of Iqīšāya, son of Ištār-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest. Hand of Ištār-šuma-ēreš, his son. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea shall not take it away, shall not deliberately let it be lost. On the same evening he should return it to its owner's house. Whoever takes it away, may Adad and Šala take him away. Nisannu, day 23, year 8, Philip, king of the lands. r.15' [] šu-si 1 du ⁸ 3.20 a-da-an-šú a-na 3.20 uru dab ^{ba} an ^u šur ^{an} [] 16' [dub-ḫa]-la nu al-til gim sumun-šú sat-ma ba-rū im ^{ba} bu ^{12-a} kūr ^{md} inana-mu-kam ša-bal-bal ^{me} ē-kur-za-kir 17' [] pa ² -liḫ ⁶⁰ im u dingir-šú nu tūm-šú ina me-reš-ti-šú la u-šam-kiš-šú [] [...] the Finger has 1 fissure: its time limit is 3 20. In 3 20 (days) the city will be seized, rain will fall, [...] [dub-ḫa]-la, not complete. Written and checked according to its original. Tablet of Iqīšāya, son of Ištār-šuma-ēreš, descendant of Ekur-zākir ...] Whoever reveres Adad and his (personal) god shall not take it away, shall not deliberately let it[ḫ] be lost. | [Iqīšāya] Iqīšāya Iqīšāya Iqīšāya Iqīšāya | [Ištār-šuma-ēreš] Ištār-šuma-ēreš Ištār-šuma-ēreš Ištār-šuma-ēreš Ištār-šuma-ēreš |
| 28. | 3, 104 | Calendar text for the month | Du'ūzu Qutāru 1 | | |
| 29. | - TCL 6, 34 | | | | |
| 30. | - RA 12, 75 | Sumerian hymn to Inana with Akkadian translation and glosses | | | |
| 31. | 4, 158 | Bārūtu dub ḫa-la | | | |

Continued

²³ The restoration of Iqīšāya and Ištār-šuma-ēreš as owner and scribe respectively is highly probable given parallels with other colophons, but it is also possible that Ištār-šuma-ēreš was the owner.

TABLE F: (Continued)

| No. | SpTU No. | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|----------|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|
| 32. | 4, 147 | Colophon fragment | 1' ^{md} inania-mu-kam dum[u-a-ni]] 2' <i>la ú-šam-kiš-šu ina te-šu ana é umun-šu hé-gur-šu šá t[um-šu^d Adad u]</i> 3' <i>ša-la lit-bal-šu zu-a li-kal-lim nu zu-a 'a' -[a imur]</i> [.....] Ištar-šuma-ēreš, his son. [.....] shall not [deliberately] let it be lost. On the same evening he should return it to its owner's house. Whoever takes it away, may [Adad and] Šala take him away. One who knows may show one who knows; one who does not know may not [see. . .]. | [lqīšāya] | Ištar-šuma-ēreš |

TABLE G: Colophons of third- and second-century Ekur-zākir protected tablets

| No. | Tablet | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|----------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 33. | BRM 4, 7 | New Year rituals | 43 <i>ki-ma sumun-šu sar-ma ba-rū ú up-puš, gaba-ri^{ss} da sumun^{bar} nig-ga⁶⁰ u an-tu₄</i> 44 <i>im^{md}60-šeš-gál^{ti} a šá^{mi} ki-din-⁶⁰ ša-bal-bal^{mi} é-kur-za-kir^{bar} maš-maš⁶⁰ u an-tu₄</i> 45 <i>ušeš-gal' šá é-re-eš unug^{ki}-ú šu^{ll} ^{md}60-tin-su-e dumu-šu ana a-ša-a-zi-šu</i> 46 <i>gid-da u₄ ^{mes}šá tin zi-ti-šu u kun-nu suhuš^{mes}-šu sar-ma ina unug^{ki} u é-re-eš</i> 47 <i>é en-ti-šu ú-kim pa-lih⁶⁰ u an-tu, ina šur-qu nu tūm-šu</i> 48 <i>unug^{ki} itūšu u₄ '25'ⁿ -kam mu-ŠU-1-kam^{mi} an-ti-ⁱ-ku-su lugal kur-kur</i> According to its original written, checked and made good. Copy of an old writing board, property of Anu and Antu. Tablet of Anu-aḫa-ušabši, son of Kidin-Anu, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest of Anu and Antu, chief priest of the Rēš temple, Urukian. Hand of Anu-balassu-iqbi, his son. For his learning, for the lengthening of his days, his wellbeing and the strengthening of his foundations he wrote and deposited (it) in Uruk, in the Rēš temple, the house of his lordship. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away by theft. Uruk, Du'ūzu, day 25, year 61, Antiochus, king of the lands. 34 <i>gim sumun-šu sar-ma ba-rū up-puš, gaba-ri^{ss} da sumun^{bar} nig-ga⁶⁰ u an-tu₄</i> 36 <i>im^{md}60-šeš-gál^{ti} dumu šá^{mi} ki-din-⁶⁰ ša-bal-bal^{mi} é-kur-za-kir^{bar} maš-maš⁶⁰ u an-tu₄</i> 37 <i>ušeš-gal' šá é-re-eš unug^{ki}-ú šu^{ll} ^{md}60-gi dumu-šu pa-lih⁶⁰ u an-tu₄</i> 38 <i>li-iš-šur li-ša-qir unug^{ki} itūšu u₄ 26-kam mu-ŠU-1-kam^{mi} an-ti-ⁱ-ku-su lugal kur-kur</i> According to its original copied, checked and made good. Copy of an old writing-board, property of Anu and Antu. Tablet of Anu-aḫa-ušabši, son of Kidin-Anu, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest of Anu and Antu, chief priest of the Rēš temple, Urukian. Hand of Anu-ušallim, his son. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu, may he guard and cherish (it). Uruk, Ulūlu, day 26, year 61, Antiochus, king of the lands. | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Anu-balassu-iqbi s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši |
| 34. | BRM 4, 8 | Hymn to Anu—Lugal-dimmer-ankia | | Anu-aḫa-ušabši s. Kidin-Anu | Anu-ušallim s. Anu-aḫa-ušabši |

Continued

TABLE G: (Continued)

| No. | Tablet | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 35. | TCL 6, 10 | <i>Šumma Izbu</i> varia | r.1' [unug ^{-ki} -ú qāt ^{mi} nig ^{-sum-mu} - ^{d60} a šá ^{md60} -en ^{-[šú-nu]} 2' [é-kur-za]-kir ^{maš-maš} ^{d60} u an-tu ₄ unug ^{ki} -ú [] 3' [pālīh Anu] u an-tu ₄ li-iš-šur u li-šá-qir ina šur-qa nu [itabbalšū] 4' [ina me]-reš-ti-šū la ú-šam-ki-šū ana 2 ⁱ u ₄ -mu ana é-en-šū [litēšū] 5' [ša itabbalšū] ^{d60} im u ^{d60} ša-la hē-tūm ^{meš} -šū u[nug [?]] 6' [u ₄ -x(7)]-kám mu-1.30-kám ^{ma} an-ti-[i-i-ku-su lugal] [... Urukēlan. Hand of Nidinti-Anu, son of Anu-bēlšunu, descendant of Ekur-zā]kir, incantation priest of Anu and Antu, Urukēan. [... Whoever reveres Anu] and Antu, may he guard and preserve (it); he shall not [take it away] by theft, shall not deliberately let it be lost. He should [return it] on the second day to the house of its owner. [Whoever takes it away], may Adad and Šala take him away. U[ruk, month x, day] 7 ⁱ , year 90, Antiochus king]. | X | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu |
| 36. | TCL 6, 1 | <i>Bārūtu</i> 97 (<i>Šumma</i> <i>Mullābīlu</i> 14) | r. 57 [im] ^{md60} tin-su-e ^{lu} gal ^{lu} ^{sa} sag-uru-a šá unug ^{ki} a šá ^{md60} -šeš-mu ^{nu} a ^{meš} -ú-ú-tú tir-an-na ^{ki} -ú 58 [qār] ^{ma} nig-sum-mu- ^{d60} a šá ^{md60} -en-šū-mu a ^{me} é-kur-za-kir ^{lu} ^{maš-maš} ^{d60} u an-tu ₄ unug ^{ki} -ú pa-līh ^{d60} 59 [u an]-tu ₄ hē-ūru u li ₆ -šá-qi-ir ina šur-qa nu tūm-šū ina me-reš-ti-šū la ú-šam-ki-šū a-na 2 ⁱ u ₄ -mu 60 [ana] é-en-šū hē-gur-šū šá tūm-šū ^{d60} im u ^{d60} ša-la hē-tūm ^{meš} -šū unug ^{ki} ^{lu} gu ₄ u ₄ -4-kám 61 mu-1.31-kám ^{ma} an-ti-[i-i-ku-su lugal] [Tablet] of Anu-balassu-iqbi, "great one" of the high city officials of Uruk, son of Anu-aha-ittannu, descendant of Aḫi'ūtu, Tiranæan. [Hand] of Nidinti-Anu, son of Anu-bēlšunu, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest of Anu and Antu, Urukēan. Whoever reveres Anu [and An]tu, may he guard and preserve it. He shall not take it away by theft, shall not deliberately let it be lost; he should return it on the second day to the house of its owner. Whoever takes it away, may Adad and Šala take him away. Uruk, Ayyaru, day 4, year 91, Antiochus king. | Anu-balassu-iqbi s. Anu-ittannu d. Aḫi'ūtu | Nidinti-Anu s. Anu-bēlšunu |

Continued

TABLE G: (Continued)

| No. | Tablet | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|---------------|---|--|---------------------------------|---|
| 37. | TCL 6, 15+ | <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> catalogue | r.1' DIŠ u ₄ ^d 60 ^d en-líl-[lál] 2' im ^{md} 60-šeš-mu a šá ^m nig-sum-mu-< ^d 60> a šá ^{md} <60>-en-šú-nu ^{lu} ša-bal-bal ^m é-kur- ^r za- <i>kir</i> ^r 3' ^{lu} maš-maš ^d 60 u an- ^r tu ₄ ^r ^{lu} šeš-gu-la šá é-re-eš (traces of 1 line) ²⁴ 5' ^[lu] maš-maš ^d 60 u an-tu ₄ ^{lu} šeš-gu-la šá é-re-eš ^{lu} umbisag ^{lu} u ₄ ^d 60 ^d en-líl-lá ^r a-na a- <i>ha-</i> <i>zi-šú</i> ^r 6' gíd-da u ₄ ^{mes} šú tin zi-šú nu gál gíg ^{mes} šú u pa-lāh en-ti en-šú sar-ma ina unug ^{ti} ú-kin 7' pa-lāh ^d 60 u an-tu ₄ nu tùm-šú unug ^{ki} ^{lu} ziz u ₄ 26-kám mu-1-ME-17 ^m an-ti-i-[ku-su] ^r lugal ^r ^{mes} lugal ^r "When Anu, Ellil . . ." Tablet of Anu-aba-iddin, son of Nidinti-<Anu>, son of <Anu>- bešunu, descendant of Ekur-zākir, incantation priest of Anu and Antu, chief priest of the Rēš temple [. .] incantation priest of Anu and Antu, chief priest of the Rēš temple, scribe of <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> . For his learning, for the lengthening of his days, his wellbeing, the prevention of illness and for revering the lordship of his lord, ²⁵ he wrote (it) and deposited (it) in Uruk. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. Uruk, Šabaṭu day 26, year 117, Antiochus, king of kings. r. 64 [pippi Šamaš-ētir mārī ša ^m Ina]-qī-bīt- ^d 60 a šá ^m šib-šū ^{ll} - ^d 60 ^{lu} ša-bal-bal ^m é-kur-za- <i>kir</i> ^{lu} maš-maš ^d 60 u an-tu ₄ unug ^{ti} ú qāt ^{md} 60-ad-gur a šá r. 65 [<i>Anu-bešunu mārī ša</i> ^m nig ^r -sum ^r -mu- ^d 60 a ^{md} 30-ti-ēr ^{lu} umbisag ^{lu} u ₄ ^d 60 ^d en-líl-lá unug ^{ti} ú pa-lāh ^d 60 u an-tu ₄ nu tùm-šú [Tablet of Šamaš-ētir, son of Ina]-qībīt-Anu, son of Šibqāt-Anu, descendant of Ekur- zākir, incantation priest of Anu and Antu, Urukean. Hand of Anu-aba-utēr, son of [Anu-bešunu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Sin-leqi-unninni, scribe of <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> , Urukean. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu shall not take it away. | Anu-aba-iddin s. Nidinti-Anu | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bešunu d. Sin-leqi-unninni |

Continued

²⁴ From the traces, it seems as if the ownership statement from r. 2' is repeated again here. The likely reason is that r. 3' is curtailed by overspill of the text from the obverse, which may have prompted the decision to begin the colophon proper again below. The alternative, that the second set of titles refers to the scribe, is unlikely since we would then have two high priests of the Rēš at the same time.

²⁵ Weidner (*A/O* 14: 187) and Hunger (1968, No. 93) read en-*ti-šú*, but based on photo col-
lation the single incomprehensible sign copied by Weidner after *ti* should rather be read as a
second, rather cramped, en followed by *šú* (which also makes better sense). It looks as though
the scribe originally wrote en-*ti-šú* and then added the second en.

TABLE H: Colophons of protected tablets owned by the Sin-lēqi-unninni family.

| No. | Tablet | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--------|
| 41. | BaM. <i>Beih.</i> 2, 5 | Kettledrum rituals | i.e.1 'im ¹ md60-en-šū-nu a šá mīg-šum-mu. ^d [60] ['unug ² ki ³ u ⁴ du ⁵ <u ⁴ >-10-kam 2 'mu ¹ -1-ME-50-'kam ¹ m ² an-ti ³ -[i-ku-su] 50' x nu ⁴ tūm ⁵ šū [Tablet] of Anu-bēšunu, son of Nidinti-Anu [. . .] Uruk, Tašrītu, day 10, year 150, Anti[ochus. . .] shall not take ²⁷ it away. ²⁷ r.i.29 dim-dim-ma an-na-a šá te-ep-pu-uš á-è 30 igi a-ḫu-ú la dumu en garza nu igi ^{mur} 31 u ⁴ me ⁵ šū lūgud-da ^{mes} zu ⁴ a-na zu ⁴ 32 li-kal-lim la zu ⁴ nu igi ina nig-gig ⁴ 60 ⁴ en-lil-lá 33 u ⁴ idim dingir ^{mes} gal ^{mes} r.ii.1 [u ⁴ me ⁵]-šū gid-da ^{mes} A trainee may see this procedure which you perform. An outsider, who is not a master of ritual, may not see. His days will be short (if he does). One who knows may show one who knows. One who does not know may not see, according to the restriction of Anu, Ellil and Ea, the great gods . . . His [days] will be long. | Anu-bēšunu (2) s. Nidinti-Anu | ----- |
| 42. | TCL 6, 44 ²⁸ | Kettledrum rituals | 30 igi a-ḫu-ú la dumu en garza nu igi ^{mur} 31 u ⁴ me ⁵ šū lūgud-da ^{mes} zu ⁴ a-na zu ⁴ 32 li-kal-lim la zu ⁴ nu igi ina nig-gig ⁴ 60 ⁴ en-lil-lá 33 u ⁴ idim dingir ^{mes} gal ^{mes} r.ii.1 [u ⁴ me ⁵]-šū gid-da ^{mes} A trainee may see this procedure which you perform. An outsider, who is not a master of ritual, may not see. His days will be short (if he does). One who knows may show one who knows. One who does not know may not see, according to the restriction of Anu, Ellil and Ea, the great gods . . . His [days] will be long. | Anu-aḫa-ittan- nu s. Rihāt- Anu ²⁹ | ----- |
| 43. | TCL 6, 48 | Lamentation | Main colophon: r.ii.36 [ne-pe]-šū šá šu ¹¹ lu ¹² gala : im md60-šeš-mu ^m a šá m ² ri-ḫat-60 37 lu ¹² gala (UŠ)-mah ⁴ 60 u an-tu ⁴ unug ^{ki} -ú gim sumun ^{bar} -šū sar-ma 38 ba-ri ⁴ u up-pu ⁴ [Proce]dure in the domain of the lamentation priest. Tablet of Anu-aḫa-ittannu, son of Rihāt-Anu, chief lamentation priest of Anu and Antu, Urukian. According to its original written, checked and made good. r.11 gim sumun-šū gub-ma gaba-ri unug ^{ki} 12 'im ¹ m ² man-nu-i-qa-pu bu ¹² -kūr md60-ba-šá-an-ni 13 a md30-ti-ēr lu ¹² šāman-lá lu ¹² gala 14 nu mud 21 33 20 lit-bā-alla Written according to its original. Urukian copy. Tablet of Mannu-iqāpu, son of Anu-iqšanni, descendant of Sin-lēqi-unninni, apprentice lamentation priest. Whoever is not reverent, may Anu take away his eyes(?). ³⁰ | Mannu-iqāpu | ----- |

²⁷ As copied and as edited by GKAB, this tablet does not contain a protective colophon. The final sign is clearly *šū*, but the other traces are not clear and do not make sense as copied. Even allowing for the possibility of more than one royal name, there would still be almost half a line before the preserved traces. There is no other element we would expect to come after the date apart from a protective formula. As copied, the fourth sign from the end looks like NU, and the series of Winkelhagens first visible after the damage might be a part of 50, for Ellil. The “three” signs before the final *šū* may be a miscopied tum which would permit the restoration of a protective formula here. However, without access to a photograph this must remain

uncertain.

²⁸ For a theory about the interesting placement of this set of protective formulae (after the ritual but before the list of ingredients and main colophon) see Lenzi 2008: 191–93.

²⁹ Although the family name is not given, the fact that no Seleucid *kalās* *not* from the Sin-lēqi-unninni family are known justifies the inclusion of this tablet as part of their corpus. Besides, it is primarily the professional specialism, rather than the familial affiliation, which is the focus of interest here.

³⁰ For 33 20 as *mēšu*, see Hunger 1968, No. 115.

Continued

TABLE H: (Continued)

| No. | Tablet | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 44. | TCL 6, 12+ | Microzodiac | <p>r.15 ta ugu^{gš} da sumun^{bar} gaba-ri unug^{ki} sar-ma iḡi-tab 16 'ap^{pi} 'pi^{md} '60-en-šū-nu^{lu} 'u^u gala '60 ma-rū šá 'nig-sum-mu-'60 ma-rū^{md} '30-ti-ér tir-an-na^{ki} 'u^u qāt^{md} '60-ad-gur a-šū^{lu} umbisag 'u^u '60 'en -[ilil] 17 ['an^{mi} 'ti- 'i-ku-su 'lugal^{mi} mud '60 en-ilil u^u 'idim ina šur-qa lā tūm-šū From an old writing board, a copy from Uruk, written and checked. Tablet of Anu- bešunu, lamentation priest of Anu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Sin-ḡeqi-unninni, Tiranaean. Hand of Anu-aba-utēr, his son, scribe of <i>Enūma Anu E[ilil]</i>. . . .], Antiochus king. Whoever reveres Anu, Ellil and Ea shall not take it away by theft.</p> | Anu-bešunu (1) s. Nidinti- Anu | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bešunu |
| 45. | TCL 6, 24+ = ACT 135 (U) | Lunar ephemeris: eclipses | <p>r.9 šá an-ḡi₆ 30 10 'im^m '60-en-šū-nu^{lu} 'u^u gala '60 ma-rū šá 'nig-sum-mu-'60 a^{md} '30-ti-ér unug^{ki} 'u^u qāt '60 '[aba-utēr mārīšū] 11 [apšar Enūma] '60^u 'en-ilil-lā tir-an-na^{ki} 'u^u unug^{ki} [bā]r^u mu-1-ME-2[1]-kām 'an-ti- 'i- 'ku-su [šarru] remainder of colophon is below and to the left of the previous section.</p> | Anu-bešunu (1) s. Nidinti- Anu | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bešunu |

Continued

³¹ Neugebauer (1955 I: 19) comments that it is difficult to interpret the traces as *ina šurqa lā itabbalšu*, and Thureau-Dangin's copy reads LA LA after 40. However, based on photo collation the first LA in Thureau-Dangin's copy appears to be a misinterpretation of a horizontal written over a vertical ruling; the reading *ina* is more likely. The rest of the line is very damaged but the remains of the following two signs are compatible with *šur* and the vertical and top diagonal of *qa*. There are then two missing signs before the probable *šū*, making it likely that the formula was in fact the expected *ina šurqa lā itabbalšu*.

TABLE H: (Continued)

| No. | Tablet | Description | Colophon | Owner | Scribe |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 46. | TCL 6, 25 = ACT 194 (Zc) | Auxiliary table: daily positions of the moon | r.1 <i>tup-pi</i> ^{md} 60- <i>num-a-bi-ut-ter-ri</i> a <i>ša</i> << <i>ša</i> >> ^{md} 60-en- <i>šu-nu</i> | Anu-aba-utēr s. Anu-bēšunu | Anu-balassu-iqbī nephew of owner |
| | | | 2 a <i>ša</i> ^{md} nīg-sum-mu- ⁶⁰ <i>ma-rū</i> ⁹ šuen-le-eq-un-nin-ni | | |
| | | | 3 ¹⁰ umbisag ¹⁴ u ₄ ⁶⁰ en-lil-lá ¹⁰ gala ⁶⁰ u an-tu ₄ | | |
| | | | 4 tir-an-na-ú qāt ^{md} 60-tin-su-e a <i>ša</i> ^{md} nīg-sum-mu- ⁶⁰ | | |
| | | | 5 šeš-a-ni iš-tur-ma a-na tin zi-šu ana ⁷ gid u ₄ ³ šu | | |
| | | | 6 a-na di ^m numun-šu a-na kun-nu suhuš-šu | | |
| | | | 7 [a]-na nu gál ¹⁵ gig-šu mud ⁶⁰ u an-tu ₄ ina šur-qi | | |
| | | | 8 [nu tū]m- ³ šu ³ ša tūm-šu ⁴ im u ³ ša-la tūm ^{mes} -šu | | |
| | | | 9 [unu]g ^{ki} bir ⁷ ¹⁰ kin u ₄ 25-kam mu-1-ME-30-[kam] | | |
| | | | 10 [Šihuku] lugal | | |
| 47. | BaM. Beih. 2, 89 | List of <i>apkallū</i> and <i>ummānū</i> | Tablet of Anu-aba-utēr, son of Anu-bēšunu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Sin-lēqi-unninni, scribe of <i>Enūma Anu Ellil</i> , lamentation priest of Anu and Antu, Tiranaean. Hand of Anu-balassu-iqbī, son of Nidinti-Anu his brother. He wrote it and for his wellbeing, for the lengthening of his days, for the health of his offspring, for the strengthening of his foundations, for the prevention of illness, <he deposited it>. Whoever reveres Anu and Antu [shall not take it away by theft. Whoever takes it away, may Adad and Šala take him away. Uruk, Ullūlu day 25, year 130, [Seleucus] king. | Anu-bēšunu (2) s. Nidinti-Anu | = owner |
| | | | r.6 [x ^{md} 60-en- <i>šu-nu</i> a <i>ša</i> ^{md} nīg-sum-mu- ⁶⁰ a ^{md} 30-ti-ēr | | |
| | | | 7 [no] ⁷ gala ¹ 60 u an-tu ₄ unug ^{ki} -ú qāt ni-šu | | |
| | | | 8 [unug] ^{ki} ¹⁰ gu ₄ u ₄ 10-kam mu-1-ME-47-kam ^{md} an-ti-i-i-ku-su lugal ¹² | | |
| | | | 9 pa-lih ⁶⁰ nu ⁷ tūm ³ šu | | |
| | | | [...] Anu-bēšunu, son of Nidinti-Anu, descendant of Sin-lēqi-unninni, lamentation priest of Anu and Antu, Urukean. His own hand. [Uruk], month Ayyāru, day 10, year 147, Antiochus king. Whoever reveres Anu shall not take it away. | | |

Continued

³² For lack of space, lugal was written on the next line, parallel to the protective formula.